DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 412 HE 001 679

AUTHOR	Stender, Bruce W.
TITLE	Present Status and Future Direction of Florida Independent Higher Education. A Report to the Select Council on Post-High-School Education.
INSTITUTION	Florida Select Council on Post High School Education, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	Jun 69
NOTE	179p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$9.05
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum, *Enrollment, Faculty, *Financial Problems, *Higher Education, Instruction, *Planning, *Private Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate and clarify the present status and future direction of independent higher education in Florida, and to present recommendations that may help strengthen this sector of Florida higher education. The report examines: (1) student enrollment; (2) curriculum and degrees granted, the faculty, their degrees, load, salaries, and employment conditions, and instruction including the use of different types of media, libraries, and approaches to innovation and evaluation; (3) the cooperative efforts among the independent colleges and between the public and private institutions; (4) the public image of these institutions and their efforts to create the "right" impression; (5) the extent and depth of the master planning effort concerning physical facilities; and (6) the financial stability or plight of the private institutions, including a summary of the opinions of these institutions' presidents, fiscal officers, and board chairmen on the financial problems. The last section of the report presents the views of the institutions' presidents and board chairmen on the future of independent higher education in general, and their institutions in particular. The appendices include: a financial report; the study participants; the curriculum study; and the interview schedule. (AF)

ED0 42412

PRESENT STATUS AND FUTURE DIRECTION OF FLORIDA INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION

By

BRUCE W. STENDER

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Report to the
Select Council on Post-High-School Education

June, 1969

HE001 679

TELEPHONE 904 · 599-5889

SELECT COUNCIL
ON
POST HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

SUITE 17, MILES-JOHNSON BUILDING
347 SOUTH DUVAL STREET
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32304

SCOP
GEORGE R. CONGER
PROJECT DIRECTOR
DOAK S. CAMPBELL
GENERAL CONSULTANT

COUNCIL MEMBERS

REUBIN O'D. ASKEW
SENATOR, 2ND DISTRICT
COUNCIL CHAIRMAN

FLOYD T. CHRISTIAN
STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

WALTER H. CLAUSEN
CHAIRMAN, STATE BOARD ADVISORY
COUNCIL FOR VOCATIONAL
AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

DAVID M. DELO
PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF TAMPA

HENTON D. ELMORE
REPRESENTATIVE, 6TH DISTRICT

CHESTER H. FERGUSON
CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF REGENTS

D. ROBERT GRAHAM
REPRESENTATIVE, 105TH DISTRICT

CHARLES HARRIS
STATE BOARD ADVISORY
COUNCIL FOR VOCATIONAL
AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

FRED H. KENT
CHAIRMAN,
STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD

HENRY D. KRAMER
BOARD OF REGENTS

JOHN E. MATHEWS, JR.
SENATOR, 8TH DISTRICT

JAMES F. MOORE
CITIZEN-AT-LARGE

RICHARD V. MOORE
PRESIDENT,
BETHUNE-COOKMAN COLLEGE

CHARLES E. PERRY
CITIZEN-AT-LARGE

VAN H. PRIEST
STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE BOARD

June 30, 1969

Gentlemen:

The State of Florida and the members of the Florida State Commission for Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 are to be commended for their support of the study here presented, financed through Comprehensive Facilities Planning Grant funds. Independent higher education has been an integral force in this country for over three-hundred years. It has been a true pioneer in educating the youth of this state.

This report is the conclusion of a ten-month study of administrative perceptions and institutional data gathered from twenty independent institutions of higher learning. The cooperation on the part of the private sector was beyond a researcher's highest expectations. However, they seemed unanimous in their expression of one desire: that the final report be more than a written document—that it be a driving force for action in incorporating the private institutions in future statewide planning.

Included in this report are the major recommendations of the panel of consultants who have guided me to its successful conclusion. Doctors George R. Conger, Theodore A. Distler, Earl J. McGrath, and W. Hugh Stickler have worked closely with Florida's Select Council on Post-High-School Education. Their recommendations are based on their appraisal of the study's results and their individual awareness of state and national trends.

It was my pleasure to have been principal investigator. It is my personal observation that the independent sector is eager for full cooperation in making Florida first in higher learning.

Respectfully,

Bruce W Stender

Bruce W. Stender
Study Director

Members of the Select Council

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL ii

LIST OF TABLES iv

RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUMMARY OF SELECTED DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION vii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. STUDENT ENROLLMENT 8

III. CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND FACULTY 18

IV. COOPERATIVE EFFORTS 42

V. PUBLIC IMAGE 48

VI. PHYSICAL FACILITIES 53

VII. FINANCIAL STABILITY 66

VIII. PROBABLE FUTURE 91

Appendix

A. FINANCIAL REPORTS 105

B. STUDY PARTICIPANTS 122

C. CURRICULUM STUDY 124

D. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 132

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Full-Time-Equivalent Enrollment Information, Selected Years and Percentage 8

2. Percent of Florida Residents Enrolled as Undergraduates in Four-Year Independent Institutions (F.T.E.) 9

3. Freshman Year Attrition Rates and Percent of Freshman Class That Will Eventually Receive the Four-Year Degree 10

4. Admissions Criteria for Entering Freshmen 12

5. Student Financial Aid 15

6. Comparison of Deans' and Students' Rationale for Attending Independent Institutions 16

7. Degrees Granted in the Independent Sector, 1967-68 18

8. Types of Degrees Granted in the Independent Sector 19

9. Academic Calendars Used in the Independent Sector 20

10. Information Used to Expand, Create, or Eliminate Academic Programs 21

11. New Approaches to Learning Used in the Independent Sector . 24

12. Library Growth 26

13. Special Committees for Curriculum Innovation 28

14. Approaches to Evaluation of Curriculum and Teaching Methods Used in the Independent Sector 29

15. Full-Time Faculty by Degree and Rank 31

16. Percent of Full-Time Faculty Holding Doctorates 32

17. Median Faculty Salaries for Nine Months Service in Four-Year Institutions in the Southeast, Southwest, Mideast, 1967-68 33

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table Page

18. Average Faculty Salaries in Liberal Arts Colleges in the United States, 1967-68 34

19. Median Salary by Rank for Academic Year 35

20. Faculty Work Load According to Function and Teaching Load . 36

21. Problems in Obtaining Faculty Members in the Independent Sector 38

22. Fringe Benefit Program in the Independent Sector 39

23. Provisions for Faculty Growth in the Independent Sector . . 40

24. Full-Time Public Relations Offices 48

25. Master Planning in Florida Independent Colleges 53

26. Number and Estimated Cost of New Construction and Campus Improvement Projects, 1968-1980 56

27. Anticipated Sources of Funds to Finance Physical Expansion, 1968-1980 57

28. Contribution to Campus Master Planning 59

29. Resource Utilization of Physical Plant 61

30. Status of Institutional Income and Expenditures, 1959-1980 . 68

31. Educational and General Budget, Institution "A" 69

32. Educational and General Budget, Institution "B" 70

33. Educational and General Budget, Institution "C" 71

34. Educational and General Budget, Institution "D" 72

35. Educational and General Budget, Institution "E" 73

36. Educational and General Allocation Per F.T.E. Student, 1959-1980 76

37. Tuition and Fee Charges at Independent Institutions in Florida, Past, Present, and Future 78

38. Instructional and Library Expenditure Compared to Amount of Student Tuition, 1968-69 79

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table | Page

39. Endowment Growth, 1959-1969 79

40. Institutional Strengths in Rank Order as Perceived by the Presidents and the Chairmen of the Board 96

41. Future Problems as Perceived by the Chairmen of the Board . . 97

PRESENT STATUS AND FUTURE DIRECTION OF FLORIDA INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION

Recommendations and Summary of Selected Descriptive Information

The purpose of this study was to investigate and clarify the present status and future direction of independent higher education in Florida. This report is based on an analysis of institutional data and perceptions of selected major administrators of those independent institutions accepting an invitation to participate. The following recommendations are presented knowing well that diversity exists among the various Florida institutions not supported by public tax funds. However, the common problems facing them in the future are serious enough to warrant the following recommendations that will hopefully strengthen and utilize this important sector of Florida higher education.

TO THE COOPERATING INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

I. In light of the fact that there are more than 13,000 places available for additional students in the private sector, it is recommended that the independent institutions reevaluate their approach to recruitment, admissions, financial aid, and student attrition. The institutions should initiate and intensify imaginative recruitment procedures that give greater attention to the kind of student that will benefit from the institutional environment found to be unique on each campus.

II. It is recommended that intensive study be made to determine accurately the rationale for student attendance at a particular institution.

CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND FACULTY

III. It is recommended that all members of the college community understand clearly the educational objectives of the institution. It is imperative that colleges and universities develop curriculum objectives defined in operational terms.

IV. Furthermore, it is recommended that continuing evaluation of these operational curricular objectives be conducted on a systematic basis. This evaluation should include departments, divisions, and where applicable, schools and colleges.

V. It is recommended that each institution annually examine its curriculum to determine whether the courses offered are required to achieve the stated institutional purposes. Non-essential courses should be removed from the institutional offerings.

VI. Independent higher education has long been noted for its freedom and flexibility. Therefore, it is recommended that more innovative and experimental approaches to learning be instituted and developed in Florida's independent colleges and universities.

COOPERATIVE EFFORTS

VII. One way of strengthening the total programs of higher education between and among independent institutions is the development of cooperative efforts in a variety of sound and workable forms. It is recommended that these efforts not be mere surface manifestations but actual programs in depth and substance.

VIII. It is recommended that the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, Incorporated (I.C.U.F.) expand its scope to meet the needs of all legitimate independent higher education in Florida.

   A. I.C.U.F. should include all private two and four year institutions accredited (or candidates for accreditation) by the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges.

   B. I.C.U.F. should develop an executive staff responsible for increased facilitation of internal and external communication, public relations, curriculum planning, and the development of internal institutional data and other meaningful information.

PUBLIC IMAGE

IX. It is recommended that each independent institution portray a public image that truly represents the institution and its programs. As a result of the true image developed by each institution, the totality of independent higher education in Florida may then be realistically portrayed, indicating not only individual differences but also similarities between and among the institutions in the independent sector.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES

X. It is recommended that trustees, administrators, faculty, and in certain instances, students be involved in various stages of campus planning. The study reveals that there is insufficient involvement in all segments of the college community.

XI. It is recommended that each institution make regular utilization studies of its present facilities to demonstrate its ability to handle increased numbers of students.

FINANCIAL STABILITY

XII. It is recommended that each institution seriously study the allocation of its current funds to instructional, library, and all other academic functions that significantly contribute to the reputation of the institution. The institutions appear to be aware of the difficult financial situation facing them in the immediate and long term future. Rising costs in all areas of operation, lack of sufficient endowment funds, a relative decline in gifts and grants, and the fear of raising tuition to the point of pricing themselves out of the market all point to an impending financial crisis.

TO THE STATE OF FLORIDA

The respective states and the federal government are becoming increasingly aware that they must strengthen and utilize the total resources of both public and independent higher education. Some states have already made studies as to how they may aid and utilize the various resources of higher learning. The federal government, in view of its past and present record, is obviously concerned with higher education--public and private--and plans to continue to finance higher education as a resource.

There is reason to believe the federal government will continue to examine new and better approaches to financing colleges and universities. The major associations representing higher education have proposed many approaches to governmental funding of higher education including broadly based assistance to individual institutions.

Private higher education is faced with severe financial problems. This study clearly indicates that the institutions in Florida are no exception. As other studies have shown, increased financial support is imperative. As it looks to the future, private higher education will find it increasingly difficult to raise money for current operations from tuition and fees, gifts and grants, and endowments.

XIII. It is, therefore, recommended that appropriate State authorities consider a variety of forms of financial assistance to the private sector including:

A. A tuition equalization grant program which would allow the Florida student a freer choice in selecting an institution of higher learning within the state.

B. The continued funding of the Regents Scholarship Program.

C. The establishment of a State Bonding Authority whereby private institutions could avail themselves of tax-free bonds for the construction of needed physical facilities.

D. The establishment of increased contractual arrangements for educational services between the State and independent institutions.

XIV. It is recommended that any State program of aid to private institutions be made in relationship to current or anticipated federal programs so that both programs complement and supplement each other.

XV. It is recommended that in order to provide for the maximum utilization of all higher education resources in the State, public and private, a Coordinating Council for higher education be established. The Council should consist of representatives of the legislature, public higher education, private higher education, and lay citizens.

A. Among the various responsibilities of this Council should be the requirement that all new institutions, public or private, make a presentation before this group verifying the need for such an institution.

B. This Council must be properly staffed to study the total higher education resources of the State, both public and private. Presently existing offices and agencies in the State, such as the Board of Regents, Division of Community Junior Colleges, and an expanded Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, Incorporated, could provide much of the pertinent information.

C. The Coordinating Council should examine institutional data from all sectors of higher education and make recommendations to the appropriate state authorities relative to types and amounts of financial assistance to the independent sector of higher education in Florida.

Selected Descriptive Information

I. Enrollments

1. Approximately one-fifth of Florida's full-time-equivalent student enrollment was enrolled in private institutions in the fall term, 1967.

2. There were 149,000 full-time-equivalent students enrolled in Florida's colleges and universities in 1967. The independent sector claimed a total of 31,851 full-time-equivalent students.

3. Of the total enrollment in the independent sector, a full-time-equivalent of 27,250, or 85.5%, was enrolled at the undergraduate level.

4. Independent higher education in Florida accounted for 42% of the undergraduate degrees granted during the 1967-68 school year.

5. It is projected that the full-time-equivalent enrollment of the private sector will increase from 31,851 to 54,500 by 1980. This will represent a 71% increase.

6. Of the 26,250 full-time undergraduate students, 12,502, or 49%, are Florida residents.

7. It was found that the independent sector could accomodate 13,725 more commuter or resident students. An assumption could be made that Florida independent higher education is currently operating at a 69% level of total student capacity.

II. Curriculum, Faculty, and Instruction

1. Independent higher education accounted for 42% of the baccalaureate degrees granted in Florida during the 1967-68 school year.

2. The independent institutions are currently granting a combined total of approximately 17 degrees and offering more than 90 undergraduate programs.

3. It is estimated that approximately 1530 full-time faculty members are currently employed in the 20 institutions participating in the study.

4. Forty-eight (48) percent of the full-time faculty hold the doctorate; 43% hold the master's degree and the remainder of the faculty hold the bachelor's degree.

5. It was found that 33% of the faculty hold the rank of professor, 20% the rank of associate professor, 29% the rank of assistant professor, and 18% the rank of instructor.

6. In the next ten years the independent institutions will need 1617 new faculty members to replace those leaving and/or to fill newly created positions.

III. Physical Facilities

1. The institutions participating in the study anticipate a 186.5 million dollar building program extending to 1980. Contrast that figure with the 131.2 million dollar program of the past ten years (41 million dollars last year alone) and one realizes the investment that is being made in brick and mortar in the independent sector.

2. There is great reliance on federal money for physical growth. It would be almost impossible for instructional and residential buildings to be completed without the aid of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

3. It was found that the president, selected board members, and the chief fiscal officer offer the major contribution to campus planning.

IV. Financial Stability

1. The independent institutions in Florida presented educational and general budgets (excluding auxiliaries, student aid, or capital outlay expenditures) totaling $94,000,000.

2. The reliance on tuition and fees for basic support of independent higher education in Florida is clearly evident. The present (1968-69) level is from 58% to 90% of the total educational and general income. By 1980, the lower level will increase to 68% and the upper level to 91% of an institution's total income.

3. Gifts and grants, long the foundation of independent higher education financing, appear to be on the decline in this State.

4. Endowment generates such little income that if inflationary trends continue, the institutions may never be able to call upon their endowment for much financial assistance.

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate and clarify the present status and future direction of independent higher education in the State of Florida. This study was based on an analysis of institutional data and perceptions of selected major administrators of those independent institutions accepting an invitation to participate.

For a period of more than 300 years following the founding of Harvard College in 1636, higher learning in this country was controlled almost entirely by private interests. Although state universities appeared before 1862, the Morrill Act actually introduced the concept of publicly supported higher education on a large scale. It was not until after World War II that this country witnessed massive growth of our public institutions of higher learning. Where thirty years ago private institutions in this country enrolled more than half the student population, today they enroll only twenty-nine (29) percent of those students attending colleges and universities and the proportion of private college enrollments is steadily shrinking.[1] In fact, the future of private higher education in this country has been challenged in some sectors by those advocating a single, coherent system of higher education.

Stoke was probably the first contemporary to advocate this "unified" scheme.[2] He has stated that, in itself, ". . . education is always aimless.

---

[1] USOE, Education Statistics, 1968.

[2] The idea dates back to Washington's time.

When the end it serves is inspiring and significant, education is inspired and significant."[3] According to Stoke, higher education is entering a new period of nationalism; an outcome of America's growth has forced the federal government to set patterns of control and outlet. As Stoke points out, "There would be little education unless there is national survival, and if national survival depends on education it is easy to conclude that education must be consciously enlisted to serve the national needs."[4]

In fact, if the traditional concepts and programs do not aid the current goals of the federal government, it will be necessary for the government to generate its own educational resources. Three years ago (1966), Stoke reemphasized his point of view that higher education had met all the requirements of a public utility as evidence of its need. It is no longer an independent entity as it has been in the past but now takes on the total dress of something useful and of solid worth.[5]

Pifer, President of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, further emphasized a need for a "unified" scheme.[6] In a recent address to the Association of American Colleges he stressed that higher education in this country has passed a crucial point in history. Currently, there is no comprehensive set of policies subscribed to universally by the more than 2500 institutions of higher learning in the United States.[7] He stated:

---

[3] Harold W. Stoke, "National Necessity and Educational Policy," Current Issues in Higher Education, American Association for Higher Education, 1959, p. 12.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Harold W. Stoke, "Emerging Concepts in Higher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, (April, 1966), pp. 402-05.

[6] One must remember the tremendous influence of this particular foundation.

[7] 1500 private, 1037 public. (1968)

> It is my view now, looking into the future, that the pressures on the United States for at least the balance of this century are going to be so great, and our colleges and universities so central to the society's well being, in ways that dwarf anything we have yet seen, that we can no longer afford the luxury of an unplanned, wasteful, chaotic approach to higher education.
>
> I believe, therefore, that, like it or not, we must now use every means at our disposal deliberately to develop a coherent, articulated set of national policies to guide its future growth along lines that can be counted on to meet the nation's needs fully, effectively, and in good time. To do less than this is to court disaster.
>
> It is conceivable that, over a long period, private higher education as we have known it in the past will gradually disappear and we will end up with a system in which some institutions historically have their roots in the government sector and some in the private sector, but all are, in a general sense of the word, public institutions, responsive to the public need and articulated with each other in a national policy framework.[8]

Hesburgh, President of Notre Dame University, has also mentioned that the single biggest problem confronting private higher education is one of survival. "Will private higher education survive in this country and what will be its role in a new position, vis-à-vis public higher education?"[9] He further states that the "private colleges and universities are attempting to market, at a rather high cost, that which is practically being given away down the street."[10]

This is not a favorable atmosphere for those advocates of independent higher education in the country or in the state. However, there have been others who have taken the opposite point of view. Logan Wilson, President of the American Council on Education, has stated, "The current trend in America toward a monolithic scheme in higher education is neither desirable or necessary and it is now more vital than ever before to strengthen the capabilities of private institutions."[11]

---

[8] Alan Pifer, "Toward a Coherent Set of National Policies for Higher Education," Chronicle of Higher Education, II(January 29, 1968), 5-6.

[9] Theodore M. Hesburgh, "Concerns of Private Colleges," American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Yearbook, 1961, pp. 20-27.

[10] Ibid.

Furthermore, Jencks and Riesman, in their recent book, The Academic Revolution, point out that:

> . . . one of the great strengths of American higher education has been its lack of regulation. It has been possible—though certainly never easy--for innovators and entrepreneurs to go into business for themselves. While most have failed, some have thrived. It would be unfortunate if America were to abandon this open system for a closed one in which nobody could establish or maintain a college unless he was either directly sponsored and controlled by the state, or else began with the enormous private resources needed to compete with top state universities in terms of academic reputation.[12]

It seems, however, that more has been said than done about upholding the integrity of private institutions. As Alan M. Cartter emphasized to the Southern Regional Education Board's Annual Convention in 1967, "I believe many states are derelict in their duty to their citizens . . . by omitting the independent colleges and universities from their master planning."[13] Cartter offered the suggestion that public higher education is not less costly than education in a non-tax-supported institution.[14] He further pointed out that each of the states has a choice: to absorb the private institutions into what is already an enormously expensive "system" or to help them remain viable. In the same speech, it was suggested that the region undertake a study to determine the relationship of the private sector to the state system of higher education.[15]

---

[11] Logan Wilson, "The Integrity of the Private College," School and Society, XCIV (December 10, 1966), 436-38.

[12] Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, The Academic Revolution (New York: Doubleday and Co, 1968), p. 290.

[13] Alan M. Cartter, "The Responsibility of States for Private Colleges and Universities," Proceedings of the Southern Regional Education Board's Annual Convention (Atlanta, Ga., 1967), p. 13.

[14] Includes the entire cost of a college education.

The State of Florida was funded through a Federal Comprehensive Facilities Planning Grant to undertake a study to determine the direction and scope of independent higher education and to explore ways to utilize and strengthen the independent institution. The need for such a study was apparent. The Chairman of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, Inc., Dr. Robert Spiro, has stated that the private institution of this state has been "ignored" in any type of statewide planning. Furthermore, since the Brumbaugh study of 1955 which stressed the necessity to involve the independent institution in statewide assessments of higher education, very little has actually been done.[16] This study proposes to fill the information gap that is needed to clarify the needs, goals, and direction of independent higher education in Florida.

Initially, an intensive and extensive review of literature was made to determine the trends that are shaping the future destiny of independent higher education. Following the review of literature, the study director developed a preliminary interview instrument and data gathering device based on the trends discovered in the research. This instrument was designed to appraise the perceptions of those administrators participating in the study. The study director met with representatives of a well-known survey research center in order to develop a valid interview instrument. Furthermore, the instrument was submitted to a panel of consultants consisting of prominent experts known for their involvement in the field of independent higher education.[17] Each critical policy or procedural area was properly reviewed with the panel to insure that all pertinent information had been included. Following a two-day session with the panel, the instrument was submitted to an expert familiar with the interview technique in order to develop a final instrument that yielded the maximum amount of information considered to be valid and reliable.

---

[15] Cartter, Op. Cit., p. 71.

[16] Stan Witwer, "Private Colleges 'Ignored'," St. Petersburg Times, May 16, 1968, sec. B, p. 6.

The following key administrators were interviewed because of their personal and professional concern for the present operation and future aspirations of their respective institutions. If a key variable to success is leadership, perceptions of those persons most intimately involved and responsible for each institution must be sought. Therefore, in each institution the following officials were interviewed:

a) The Chairman of the Board of Trustees
b) The President
c) The Academic Dean or Vice-President
d) The Chief Fiscal Officer

The actual investigation consisted of two parts. The first part involved a collection of pertinent factual institutional data that supported and substantiated administrative responses obtained in the interview. The second part consisted of an interview based on the instrument described above. This instrument was used to elicit the administrator's response to the alternatives that are open to him in developing the future direction of his institution.

---

[17] The panel consisted of the following:

Dr. George R. Conger, III, Vice-President for Administration, George Peabody College for Teachers
Dr. Theodore A. Distler, President Emeritus, American Association of Colleges
Dr. Earl J. McGrath, Director, Institute for Higher Education, Temple University
Dr. W. Hugh Stickler, Professor and Head, Department of Higher Education, Florida State University

The interview schedule was sent to each participant at least one week in advance of the interview to allow the administrator to become familiar with the nature of the questions. There were some comprehensive questions for all administrators; however, basically the interview was concerned only with the areas of specialized knowledge and responsibility of each administrator. For example, the chief fiscal officer was not asked detailed questions in the area of curriculum planning. In addition, the name of administrator and institution remains anonymous to insure maximum objectivity and thus it allowed the participants the opportunity to respond in an open manner. Unless there were objections, a recording of each interview was made to preserve accurate documentation.

II. STUDENT ENROLLMENT

According to 1967 enrollment figures the independent sector of higher education in Florida enrolled twenty-one (21) percent of the full-time-equivalent (f.t.e.) student body. Table 1 stresses the point that even though total enrollments are increasing yearly in the independent sector, its percentage of total enrollment is decreasing steadily.[1]

TABLE 1

FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENT INFORMATION
SELECTED YEARS AND PERCENTAGE

	1962	%	1967	%	1975	%	1980	%
Private	22,027	30	31,851	21	48,000	16	54,500	15
Public	51,273	70	117,156	79	240,000	84	305,270	85

As Table 2 describes, forty-nine (49) percent of the undergraduates enrolled at the institutions visited were Florida residents. Forty (40) percent of the freshmen f.t.e. enrollment were Florida residents. However, as Table 2 indicates, not all institutions have Florida residents making up forty-nine (49) percent of their student body. One institution reported that a low of twelve (12) percent of its undergraduate students were Florida residents, yet another reported a high of eighty (80) percent.

---

[1] Supplement on Enrollment Projections to 1975 and 1980 to the Florida Higher Education Facilities Study: 1968, p. 22.

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF FLORIDA RESIDENTS ENROLLED AS UNDERGRADUATES IN FOUR-YEAR INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS (F.T.E.)

Institution	Undergraduate F.T.E.	Freshman F.T.E.
51	72	63
52	87	93
53	25	22
55	15	12
58	47	50
60	54	43
61	59	56
62	67	41
65	12	11
67	74	40
69	21	20
70		63
71	36	29
72	54	
73	14	18
Total	26,277	6,225
Florida	12,502	2,468
Total Florida	49	40

The attrition rate is a very important economic and educational factor in the status of an institution of higher learning. Table 3 examines the attrition rate for the independent sector at the end of the freshman year and the percentage of the entering class that eventually will receive the four-year degree. The freshman attrition rate varied from ten (10) percent at four institutions to a high of forty (40) percent at another institution. Furthermore, one institution reported that fifty-five (55) percent of the entering freshman class eventually receives its

TABLE 3

FRESHMAN YEAR ATTRITION RATES AND PERCENT OF FRESHMAN CLASS THAT WILL EVENTUALLY RECEIVE THE FOUR-YEAR DEGREE

Institution	Freshman Attrition Rate Percentage	Percentage Eventually Receiving Degree
52	10	55
55	40	35
58	30	30
59	20	12
60	10	50
61	10	40
62	10	50
67	25	40
69	35	53
70	25	30
71	30	30
72	20	40

four-year degree where another institution will graduate only twelve (12) percent of its entering class.

The academic deans were asked to give what they thought was the current enrollment capacity of their institution; how many more they could accomodate either as resident or commuter students considering their physical and human resources. It was found that the independent sector could accomodate 13,725 more students. Using the figures in Table 1, an assumption could be made that Florida independent higher education is currently operating at a sixty-nine (69) percent level of total student capacity.

Student Recruitment

Table 4 describes the admissions criteria for an entering freshman student. No two independent institutions in Florida approach the admissions procedure exactly alike. Some institutions are noted for their high aptitude examination scores, others for their selectivity based on different variables. One of the strong assets found in the private sector was the willingness of a limited number of institutions to accept the marginal or "C" average student. A few administrators admitted they were forced because of economic realities to seek this type of student. However, the administrators also stressed that they were not dissatisfied with the academic progress of the marginal student. It should be noted that each institution has its own minimum standards for entering freshmen. For instance, one institution mentioned that they will accept a student if he had a "C+" average in high school, ranked in the upper half of his graduating class, and made a minimum score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test of at least 900. Another institution pointed out that the average Scholastic

TABLE 4

ADMISSIONS CRITERIA FOR ENTERING FRESHMEN

					Examinations		
Institution	Grades	Rank	Recommendations	Fla.	SAT	ACT	Other
51	X	X	X		X		
52	X	X	X	X	X		X
53	X	X	X	X	X	X	
54	X						
55	X					X	X
58	X	X	X	X	X	X	
59	X		X		X		
60	X		X		X		
61	X	X	X		X		
62	X	X	X	X	X		
65	X	X	X		X		
67	X	X			X		X
69	X		X	X	X		
70	X	X	X	X	X		
71	X	X	X		X		
72	X	X	X		X		
73	X	X					X

Aptitude Test score was 1400 and that usually the students admitted ranked in the upper ten (10) percent of their high school graduating classes.

Independent Colleges and universities in Florida recruit students in various ways to their institutions. The most successful recruitment method used was the high school visitation where admissions counselors travel to various high schools to discuss their institution with prospective students. Other successful methods used were the college night visitation where several colleges send admissions counselors to a high school for a one night program, and mail campaigns that introduce a student to a college by means of literature. Other methods used by various institutions included "career days" where institutions would invite students from the surrounding high schools to spend a day on the campus; church functions that would bring parents and students to the campus; invitations to high school guidance counselors to spend a day on the campus; and cooperative efforts on the part of two or more institutions. It is interesting to note that the two least successful recruitment efforts mentioned were the use of alumni and commercial admissions centers.

The academic deans were asked what role the State of Florida should play in student recruitment. A dean commented that the "State should be aware of the resources available in independent higher education and not hesitate to have students referred to private colleges." Another dean stressed that independent institutions should be "permitted to publish pertinent information concerning their academic programs in the journals, magazines, and papers of the various state agencies." Most deans thought that the State should not be involved in the recruitment of students; however, they would like the State to allow the student a greater choice in his plans for a college education. This choice, they explained, would be broadened with a tuition equalization plan mentioned in another section of this study.

As noted previously, the future of many independent institutions will depend on their ability to attract students. In the highly competitive market for the college student, one of the reasons students will attend a particular institution is based on a grant of financial aid. Table 5 describes the number of grants and dollar-value-amount of financial aid offered during the 1964-65 and the 1968-69 academic years. The percent of the aid granted through federal and State sources is included to stress the importance of this aid. Governmental aid accounted for ninety (90) percent of the total financial aid given in one institution and the minimum amount of governmental aid found at a four-year independent institution was twenty-one (21) percent of the total aid granted.[2]

While visiting each campus, students were asked why they chose to attend the particular institution. Table 6 compares the students' reaction with that of the academic dean who was asked why he thought students were attracted to his campus.[3]

The students interviewed were asked if they had the opportunity to make the choice again, would they have chosen the same institution? The overwhelming majority replied in the affirmative indicating they were satisfied with their choice. Asked if there were any advantages in attending an independent institution as opposed to a public institution, a student replied, "Yes, we can help set the rules and regulations.

---

[2] Over ninety-five percent of the government aid came from federal sources such as the N.D.E.A. loan program, work-study program, guaranteed loan program, and economic opportunity grants. The State money came from the Regents Scholarships, Teacher, Nursing, and other special scholarship programs.

[3] Since only a limited number of students were interviewed, Table 6 should not be considered a statistically reliable sample of the total student body in Florida independent colleges.

TABLE 5

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

Institution	1964-65			1968-69		
	Grants	Dollar Value	Percent Federal and State	Grants	Dollar Value	Percent Federal and State
51				424	$262,652	41
52		$178,348	56	493	282,220	90
53				146	86,900	58
54	286	145,948	54	812	323,499	92
58	47	23,747	75	306	155,970	83
59				1030	890,775	59
60	605	511,380	49	1395	806,736	65
61	430	253,328	55	807	519,000	48
62	870	218,406	44	1362	812,701	31
65	137	255,833	15	427	499,853	21
67	227	246,393	18	432	417,000	42
69	58	23,205		202	130,782	64
70		538,133	39			
72				632	383,835	63
73	4	1,400		3	1,050	

TABLE 6

COMPARISON OF DEANS' AND STUDENTS' RATIONALE FOR ATTENDING INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS
(Rank Order of Response)

Academic Deans	Students
1. Size of Institution	1. Location
2. Location	2. Academic Programs
3. Academic Programs	3. Religious Emphasis
4. Specialized Programs	4. Admissions Policies
5. Individual Attention	5. Social Life
6. Parents	6. Specialized Programs
7. Religious Emphasis	7. High School Counselor
8. Placement in Industry	8. Departmental Strength
9. Cost	
10. Departmental Strength	

However, some students might be disgruntled because of the lack of professional training offered here." Another student thought that the faculty was truly concerned about the average student. He emphatically stated, "Let's face it, academically it fits our need. When there is a new idea, they [administration] are willing to try it. Socially, it's another story. Most of us are urban students dropped in a rural area."

Not all students favored attendance at a small independent institution. One student summarized the minority opinion when stating, "It's small and we do get individual attention but we are treated pretty lousy . . . [we have] too many restrictions and the conservative faculty is interested in 'in loco parentis'. The prevailing attitude is 'playing it cool' rather than commiting oneself."

A student body president summarized his position when he pointed out:

> I do not think that the advantages lie in the independent public split but rather in the small-large [dichotomy]. Many independent

> schools are small; they can afford to have a personality that is lacking at large schools. For the involved student, it seems that issues at public and independent colleges are at times different, such as financial support and backing. Small independent schools offer unequaled opportunity for close contact with the faculty and administration and a chance to grasp how a university works. If I was choosing colleges again and did not choose this institution, I would definitely choose a small independent college.

It might appear that it is very important for the independent institution to attract students that "fit" its particular environment. Since the late 1950's there have been several tests developed to determine various characteristics concerning the institutions' image and the personality characteristics of the students attending the various colleges and universities. The deans were asked if they had given any of the newly developed tests[4] to determine what type of student was attracted to their campus or how students felt about the institution. Sixteen (16) deans replied that they have not determined the environmental press of their institutions. Four (4) replied that they had administered this type of test but only two deans mentioned that the results were studied with any degree of seriousness.

In summary, it should be stressed that the independent sector of higher education in Florida must make a serious appraisal of its recruiting techniques, financial aid policies, and attrition rates in order to attract a student body that fits the institutional environment. Although enrollment predictions indicate that each independent institution will enroll more students by 1980,[5] the competition for the right student for each institution will also increase.

---

[4] College Characteristics Index, College and University Environmental Scale, Activities Index, and College Student Questionnaire are examples of tests of environments.

[5] Supplement on Enrollment Projections to 1975 and 1980 to the Florida Higher Education Facilities Study: 1968, p. 22.

III. CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, AND FACULTY

The second most important variable in the future of Florida independent higher education is the curriculum. As pointed out in the section on fiscal stability, the very future of most independent institutions will depend on their ability to attract students who will pay the tuition to support the institution. In order to attract the paying clientele the institutions must offer programs that meet the needs and abilities of the student and the educational goals of the institution.

Curriculum

Independent higher education accounted for forty-two (42) percent of the baccalaureate degrees granted in Florida during the 1967-68 school year.[1] Table 7 gives the total number of degrees granted in various categories for those institutions that supplied data.[2]

TABLE 7

DEGEEES GRANTED IN THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR
1967-68

Associate	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate
82	4,777	915	326

---

[1] Based on a total of 11,303 degrees granted. American Council on Education, A Fact Book on Higher Education (Washington: American Council on Education, 1968).

[2] Two independent junior colleges did not offer these data.

The independent institutions are currently granting approximately seventeen degrees and offering more than ninety undergraduate programs.[3] Table 8 describes what degrees are now granted and what degrees will be instituted in the next decade.

TABLE 8

TYPES OF DEGREES GRANTED IN THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

Degree	Now Granted	Will Institute
A.A.	4[a]	1
A.B.	14	
B.Ed.	1	
B.F.A.		1
B.M.		1
B.S.	12	
B.S.N.	1	
M.A.	4	2
M.A.T.	1	1
M.B.A.	1	1
M.Ed.	2	3
M.S.	5	3
C.A.S.	1	
Ed.D.	1	
Ph.D.	2	
J.D.	2	
M.D.	1	
M.S.W.	1	

[a] Number of institutions granting the degree.

Table 9 points out the type of academic calendar now in use at the various independent institutions of higher learning. The semester system is the most prevalent calendar in the independent sector as opposed to the quarter system now in use by the publicly supported universities in

---

[3] Please refer to Appendix C. An attempt was made to include every program offered at institutions participating in the study.

Florida. It appears that most institutions are satisfied with their calendars since only one institution indicated any change forthcoming in the next decade.

TABLE 9

ACADEMIC CALENDARS USED IN THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

Calendar	Now Used	Will Institute
Semester	9	
Trimester	3	
Quarter	2	
Year Round Equal Enrollment	2	1
4-1-4, 15-4-15	1	
Trimester-One Month Independent Study	1	

The Academic Deans were asked if they should expand their present educational programs and/or create new programs. Fifteen (15) replied in the affirmative and two (2) stated they did not anticipate the expansion or creation of new programs. As one dean, who replied in the affirmative, mentioned, "Things change, we must be ready." Another pointed out that at his institution they wanted:

> . . . to do well what we have already undertaken. We don't anticipate offering new programs or new degrees. If the question is do we want to offer new majors, the answer is no . . . if it is to make use of educational technology, the answer is definitely yes. We want to experiment with new media.

One institution presents the problem of curriculum expansion to an "Educational Policy Committee" made up of faculty, students, and trustees.

There was more mixed reaction when the deans were asked if the institutions, in the next decade, should curtail any of the programs that they now offer. Five replied, "yes," eight, "no," and four were "undecided." It might be significant that twelve replied no or undecided since it appears that once a program is established on a campus, it becomes a part of "tradition" and very difficult to remove from the curriculum.

Several methods are used to determine when to expand, create, or eliminate academic programs in the independent sector. Table 10 lists those responses that were most often given as a rationale. One dean mentioned that his institution has moved from a philosophical approach to the curriculum to an economic approach. He said:

> Ten years ago we decided to offer majors in certain traditional and well-accepted areas—quite irrespective of any market research in the areas. We are now building to full professional strength in each area. However, we have some programs that are attracting more students than we anticipated, and some less. Now we have to take a hard look at the enrollment figures. We are coming to the point where we have to change our principle in determining the strength of each department.

TABLE 10

INFORMATION USED TO EXPAND, CREATE, OR
ELIMINATE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

1. Steady Decline in Enrollment
2. Demands of Students and Teachers
3. Financial Status of the College
4. Needs of the Community
5. Needs of the State and Nation
6. Student Government Feedback
7. Faculty Curriculum Committee Decisions
8. Studies of Other Institutions
9. Publications and Surveys

The problem of program duplication among the various institutions—state and independent—was discussed with the chief academic officer. One dean remarked:

> We haven't been too conscious that duplication exists in comparison to our program. We are not engaged in destructive competition. We do

> not fear state competition because we feel we are engaged in something different. . . . We are drawing our students from a different section of the ecological scene of higher education.

He went on to point out, however, that it is:

> very important that there is a flow of information between the public and private institutions. We have had very cordial relations with state institutions; however, we usually find out about new programs from the newspaper and vice versa. It would be better if there could be a more informed exchange of information. We must get together to know what their projections are and they would know our projections.

Another dean pointed out that any college that is not specialized must have its own general/liberal studies program.

> I guess my biggest point is that I would not give up the ability to choose what programs our institution so desires to offer. This would be the same as the Board of Regents determining its own programs. I think the private institution should and will make curricular decisions based on their constituency. I hope for high level communication and that avoidance in duplication of specialized programs would naturally follow. The avoidance of certain kinds of duplication serves the people of the community. It's true to say that people could save taxes. I hope state and private institutions can serve themselves by keeping communication open and avoid duplication of some specialized programs.

One dean pleaded for the opportunity to cooperate more on the interinstitutional level among private institutions. He said, "If we could be allowed to take advantage of strong programs at other institutions we wouldn't have to develop our own." Another dean warned that dealing with duplication might be too much in the realm of "intangibles."

> If college is more than what comes in a classroom, then we do not have a good level of comparison of duplication. Just as all high schools are not the same, all colleges are not the same. We respect and teach values here and we can take stands where public institutions cannot.

Most deans felt quite strongly that the need for new state-supported institutions should be well established prior to approving their development. They hoped that existing programs would be made use of before adding new ones, especially in specialized areas.

In a closer examination of the various institutions' approach to instruction it was determined that fourteen (14) institutions indicated that they stressed general/liberal studies. Of the fourteen, nine (9) indicated that the general education sequence lasted the entire four year period. This method was approached in different ways but examples of the "hourglass" curriculum and the senior "capstone" course were evident in a few institutions. Generally, the approach was distributive in nature with very few general education courses per se. Twelve (12) institutions indicated they stressed professional studies in their curriculum.[4] Of the twelve, only five (5) indicated that the professional studies program lasted the entire four years. This might be an indication of the concern for a well-balanced program offering both specialized and general/liberal study courses throughout the baccalaureate experience. There does seem to be a trend in moving the emphasis on the major from the last two years of the four year experience to the entire undergraduate program. Nine (9) institutions indicated they allowed their students to begin on their major during the first year and seven (7) institutions mentioned they still stress the major the last two years.

Instruction

Table 11 examines the use of different types of media. In the interviews with the academic dean and less structured talks with faculty and students, it was found that lectures, seminars, discussions, and other more traditional approaches to learning have not given way to the "advance of "new media." However, it should be pointed out that a few of the independent institutions in Florida are seriously determined to find out exactly how useful the new methods can be in attaining educational objectives.

---

[4] Many institutions indicated they offered both professional programs and general/liberal studies programs.

TABLE 11

NEW APPROACHES TO LEARNING USED IN THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

Method	Now-in-Use[a]	Will-be-Instituted[b]
Closed Circuit T.V.	5	4
Computer Assisted Instruction	4	2
Directed Study	1	
Independent Study	14	2
Instructional Films	15	1
Language Laboratory	12	2
Learning/Listening Laboratories	7	4
Programmed Instruction	5	3
Regional E.T.V.	3	3
Tutorials	1	
Video Tape	6	6

[a] Number of institutions using method.

[b] Number of institutions that will institute method in next decade.

The "Directed Studies" program offered at one institution might offer a way to avoid unnecessary duplication and proliferation of courses in the four-year liberal arts college. It is structured so a professor could offer any course he developed or any course that a student was interested in taking. The professor is responsible for developing a syllabus or course guide with concise learning objectives to be attained. The student, independent of any classroom work, displays to the professor that he has met the course's learning objectives whereupon the student is granted credit.

Library growth was used as another indicator of institutional advancement. Three points in time were used to determine past, present, and projected library acquisitions. Table 12 points out the number of volumes housed in the various libraries. It should be pointed out that the size of the library depends on many variables: size of the institution, age of the institution, the capacity of the physical structure housing the acquisitions. Eleven of the institutions visited had libraries built within the past decade. The structures were adequately equipped for undergraduate and, in some cases, graduate instruction and there was room provided for expansion. Three (3) other institutions were in the process of building new libraries which were badly needed. A casual investigation of all the libraries indicated that most institutions provided generally well for the level of instruction being carried on at the college. However, there were some glaring contrasts with outdated texts and periodicals that seemed to exist to fill the shelves rather than being instruments of educational effort.

Just as there are a few independent institutions genuinely interested in using new classroom techniques, there are very few "innovative" attempts being explored.[5] Two institutions are attempting a program that allows

---

[5] One must realize that today there is very little innovation going on in the whole of higher education.

TABLE 12

LIBRARY GROWTH[a]

Institution	1963-64	1968-69	1974-75
51	40,027	68,962	100,000
52	40,880	50,993	116,000
53	9,143	35,000	60,000
54		34,000	
55	900	12,000	27,000
58	7,700	40,000	75,000
59	27,436	40,283	73,000
60	46,500	85,000	130,000
61	91,674	110,000	170,000
62	81,906	127,386	167,386
65		55,000	100,000
69	10,500	33,500	70,000
70	90,000	123,000	175,000
71	649,455	854,788	1,200,000
72	79,000	89,823	150,000
73	3,500	8,200	20,000

[a] Number of books and periodicals.

a student to develop his own undergraduate sequence. Working with a faculty committee, the student is allowed to escape the academic "lockstep" and design an individual baccalaureate program that will hopefully meet his individual needs. Both institutions were eager to experiment with the program but cautioned that the success of the program would depend on the type of student and the amount of time the faculty committee would be willing to spend working with the program.

Two other institutions are working on a program called MOTIVE. "Move On To Individual and Vital Education" is in campus-wide use at one institution and in operation in a limited way at the other. Its purpose is to take a student from high school and, by means of a general theme throughout the year, develop certain skills and conceptual development to a certain level of proficiency. For instance, all freshmen will hear a talk about a current topic in the humanities, social, physical, or biological sciences. This talk will be followed by discussion groups in which the student will learn to communicate with the spoken word. Writing laboratories are also available where the student must develop skill with the written word. When the student meets a certain level of proficiency, he moves on even though there are no grades given for the entire freshman year. However, the student is not allowed to advance to the sophomore level until he meets a prescribed level of development. This program may not work in all colleges but the fact remains that the institutions involved are attempting to make their program meet the needs and abilities of their clientele.

Another dean explained, rightfully so, that the entire institution with which he was affiliated was dedicated to innovation in higher education. Some institutions are attempting to use a new type of academic calendar to develop innovative programs. In fact, one institution in particular has become especially noteworthy in its attempt to use a one month term as an opportunity to allow students to do individual study projects on or off campus.

Not every dean felt it was the duty of the institution to innovate. One mentioned, "We do not intend to be the innovator and experimenter. It doesn't really go with the student and teacher relationship."

Table 13 points out how many institutions have "special committees" to deal with the stimulation of innovation, change and experimentation on the respective campuses. Initially, it is encouraging to note that twelve (12) institutions indicated they had such a committee. Upon further discussion it was discovered that the committee was, with a few excellent exceptions, the standard curriculum committee found on most college campuses. Furthermore, it was ascertained that only six (6) institutions have had an organized effort to introduce faculty to new media methods and procedures. Another six (6) indicated that they were initiating such an effort in the next decade.

TABLE 13

SPECIAL COMMITTEES FOR CURRICULUM INNOVATION

Yes	No	No Reply
12	6	2

Furthermore, it was determined how curricular programs were evaluated in the various institutions. Table 14 points out how the institutions, now and in the future, evaluate programs, methods, and structures of curriculum and instruction. Notice that only five (5) institutions currently have a full- or part-time evaluation officer.

All but three (3) institutions indicated that they were engaged in some type of cooperative effort in the area of curriculum and

TABLE 14

APPROACHES TO EVALUATION OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHING METHODS USED IN THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

Part-Time or Full-Time Evaluation Officer			Faculty Committee			Individual Faculty Members		
Yes	No	Future	Yes	No	Future	Yes	No	Future
5	9	3	10	3	4	10	6	1

instruction. Probably, the most formal arrangement exists between two institutions that allow students from one campus to earn a degree in a program offered at the other campus. This consortium has appeared to work very well in the early stages of its development. Another noteworthy cooperative effort is the five college Associated Mid-Florida College Consortium. Originally funded by the Danforth Foundation as a program to sponsor faculty and cultural exchanges, it has expanded into other cooperative arrangements. There was evidence of increasing cooperation among many of the independent colleges and the community junior colleges. For instance, three colleges indicated they allowed direct transfer from the local community college into the independent institution at the completion of the junior college's transfer program. Another institution is actively engaged in the preparation of junior college faculty members for the local community college.

One of the most interesting approaches to cooperative effort is now in the planning stage. One established institution is currently working with another institution to establish a satellite college. Both institutions will remain autonomous but will share facilities, programs, and faculty members. This will allow the new institution to create programs in areas that the established institution has not been able to initiate. If this approach is successful, as it appears to be in California, it may be one of the answers to curricular stability in independent higher education.

Generally, however, the approach to cooperative efforts in Florida can be summed up pretty well by a dean's statement, "We have not gone nearly as far as we should. Weaknesses are the human ones and people tend to be insular about their own programs. 'Excellence' has a provincial tone. We often talk about the sense of it [cooperative efforts] but . . . "

The obvious advantage in engaging in cooperative efforts is the availability of additional resources. The cost-factor just would not allow each institution to engage in many of the programs they could offer a student due to cooperative arrangements. Nevertheless, the academic deans pointed out that there were weaknesses to such arrangements. As one dean pointed out:

> It is hard to find other institutions that have the same aims and educational objectives for their students. What you have to do is strive for limited objectives. Everybody feels that the consortium is going to be run based on the objectives of their institution so there are terrific problems of communication.

One dean pointed to personality problems as an inhibiting factor in close cooperation. Another pointed out that the releasing of confidential information was a problem. Other weaknesses were the lack of time available for meetings, geography, and communication. All these variables can be justified but one should also consider the advantages in cooperating before completely ruling out the possibility.

One dean suggested that the way to beat the communication barrier was to establish a statewide "Council of Academic Deans" where honest evaluation of educational goals could be discussed. He stressed that it would not be a policy-making body dictating types of programs but it would be a forum to enable the deans to examine existing programs and hear about the establishment of new programs before the programs are read about in the local paper.

Faculty

Turning to an examination of independent college faculties we find that forty-eight (48) percent of the full-time teaching faculty hold the doctorate. Forty-three (43) percent hold the master's degree and the remainder of the faculty hold the bachelor's degree. Table 15 points out the number of doctorates, master's, and bachelor's degree holders and examines the number found in each professorial rank.

TABLE 15

FULL TIME FACULTY BY DEGREE AND RANK

	Doctorates	Masters'	Bachelors'	Total
Professor	371	124	16	511
Associate Professor	191	103	14	308
Assistant Professor	174	240	27	441
Instructor	8	187	75	270
Total	744	654	132	1530

Additionally, it was found that professors accounted for thirty-three (33) percent of the faculty followed by twenty-nine (29) percent at the assistant professor rank, twenty (20) percent at the associate professor rank, and eighteen (18) percent of the faculty at the instructor rank. Furthermore, taking the independent faculty as a whole, it was found that seventy-three (73) percent of the professors had earned the doctorate. It should be mentioned that not all independent institutions can report that their college has forty-eight (48) percent of the teaching faculty holding doctorates. Table 16 examines the institutions belonging to the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, Inc., to point out that differences do exist among accredited four-year institutions.

TABLE 16

PERCENT OF FULL-TIME FACULTY HOLDING DOCTORATES

Institution	Percent	Institution	Percent
A	43	H	79
B	39	I	53
C	26	J	24
D	52	K	52
E	30	L	61
F	74	M	45
G	34		

Faculty salaries are another indication of the ability of the independent sector to attract qualified personnel to their institutions. In order to establish a base of comparison, Table 17 examines the median salary for four-year institutions located in the Southwest, Southeast, and Mideast sections of the United States.

TABLE 17

MEDIAN FACULTY SALARIES FOR NINE MONTHS
SERVICE IN FOUR YEAR INSTITUTIONS IN
SOUTHEAST, SOUTHWEST, MIDEAST
1967-68[7]

	Southeast	Southwest	Mideast
All Ranks	$ 9,546	$10,365	$10,419
Professors	13,150	13,740	15,529
Associate Professors	10,608	11,255	11,576
Assistant Professors	8,944	9,514	9,508
Instructors	7,092	7,465	7,495

Table 18 further points out the average faculty salary by type of institution in the United States. Since most of the institutions under study are liberal arts colleges, a comparison will be made of similar institutions located in the United States with the exception of the average nine month salaries of the Florida State University System.[8] Table 19 presents the median faculty salaries, by rank, of those institutions participating in the study and submitting this information. Note that six (6) institutions studied exceed the median salary for professors in the southeast area but there is only one institution exceeding the mideast regional median salary for professors. However, since valid comparisons can be made only by examining each institution, Table 19 should be used as a guidline for reference and comparison.

---

[7] E. F. Schietinger, Fact Book on Higher Education in the South (Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1968), p. 62.

[8] Select Council on Post-High-School Education, 1969 Report and Recommendations (Tallahassee, Florida: Select Council on Post-High-School Education, 1969), p. F-22.

TABLE 18

AVERAGE FACULTY SALARIES IN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES[a]
IN THE UNITED STATES
1967-68

	Independent	Church-Related	Public	Florida State University System
Professor	$14,118	$12,326	$14,411	$15,992
Associate Professor	10,894	10,079	11,491	12,026
Assistant Professor	9,019	8,560	9,526	9,819
Instructor	7,451	7,140	7,621	7,306

For purely descriptive reasons it was found that the averages for each rank were as follows: Professor $12,415, Associate Professor $10,262, Assistant Professor $8,686, and Instructor $7,256. These figures were found to be above the national average in "Church-Related" liberal arts colleges but were lower than independent and public liberal arts colleges and the Florida State University System. Furthermore, Florida's independent college average median salary was found to be lower than the Southeast for four-year institutions. It should be pointed out that the figures compared salary only and that most institutions visited had substantial fringe benefit programs that boosted total compensation to at least ten (10) percent above the median salary for each rank.

TABLE 19

MEDIAN SALARY BY RANK FOR ACADEMIC YEAR

Institution	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Instructor
51	$15,340	$10,822	$ 9,016	$7,526
52	10,000	9,000	8,000	7,000
53	10,500	9,100	7,600	7,150
54	7,200	7,000	6,600	6,000
55	10,000	9,200	8,500	7,800
58	12,600	11,300	8,500	7,400
59	9,700	9,000	7,200	6,800
60	14,774	11,629	10,104	8,383
61	$9,885 for all degrees and ranks			
62	13,750	11,500	9,750	7,500
65	17,275	13,569	10,580	8,050
67	15,225	10,920	9,200	7,350
69	13,000	10,250	8,750	7,550
70	11,041	9,981	8,864	7,345
71	14,200	11,500	9,500	6,400
72	11,613	9,154	8,119	6,790
73				7,049

A comparison of faculty work load strongly pointed out that the two- and four-year independent college stressed the teaching function of the college. Table 20 describes the current faculty work load according to the number of semester or quarter hours taught per term and the percentage of time that each faculty member spends performing the teaching, research, or other related functions.

TABLE 20

FACULTY WORK LOAD ACCORDING TO FUNCTION AND TEACHING LOAD

Institution	Percent Teaching	Percent Research	Percent Other	Teaching Load (Credit Hours)
51	85	-	15	12
52	95	5	-	12
53	85	-	15	12
54	90	-	10	15
55	80	2	18	10
58	85	15	-	12
59	90	-	10	15
60	75	10	15	9
61	80	-	20	12
62	90	10	-	14
67	90	-	10	12
69	50	-	50	13
70	90	-	10	12
72	80	-	20	15
73	95	-	5	12

Many deans pointed out that the "Other" category on their campus would mean time spent with academic counseling, group advising, and other related functions. It is interesting to note that on most independent college campuses in Florida the rule of academic advancement "publish or perish" does not exist. A third approach to determine faculty work load--the amount of clock hours each faculty member puts in per week--was attempted, but the majority of deans mentioned that they did not have enough information to make an estimation. However, of those deans who made estimates, an average of thirty clock hours per week to eighty clock hours per week was reported.

One of the critical problems facing independent higher education in this State is the recruitment of qualified faculty members dedicated to the educational goals of the various institutions. It was discovered that in the next ten years the independent institutions would need 1617 new faculty members to replace those leaving the institution and/or to fill newly created positions. Table 21 lists the major problems in obtaining faculty members. Generally, there were two recurring problems noted: lack of research opportunities on campus and teaching salaries not competitive with other institutions. Most deans pointed to files of applications of people wanting to teach in their institution but they pointed out that it was the sunshine that attracted many of the applications and not the educational function of the institutions. Other problems noted were the lack of availability of good Negro teachers, problems stemming from church relationship, and even prejudice on the part of the top professors of the Northeast against the Southeast, these men thinking the approach to higher education in this region too provincial.

Once the faculty is recruited it is sometimes a problem to keep them for a period of years. Table 22 points out that one of the biggest advantages in teaching in an independent institution is its liberal fringe benefit program.

TABLE 21

PROBLEMS IN OBTAINING FACULTY MEMBERS IN THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

3[a]	A. Fringe Benefits Not Competitive
5	B. High Cost of Living
3	C. Inability to Pay Moving Expenses
2	D. Inability to Provide Travel Reimbursement for Interviews
4	E. Inadequate Office Space
2	F. Inadequate Housing in Community
11	G. Lack of Research Opportunity
5	H. Library
2	I. Location of Institution
2	J. Poor Facilities
11	K. Salaries Are Not Competitive
6	L. Teaching Load

[a] Number of institutions noting the problem.

In addition to those mentioned, other fringe benefits included a few institutions providing waiver of tuition for dependents at other colleges and universities and free lunch served to the faculty. Several deans stressed that they would like to see a waiver of tuition for dependents at any independent institution in Florida. Since there is no formal communications network among all independent institutions most deans did not know how the other institutions felt about this proposal.

In addition to fringe benefits, it was determined that independent institutions made certain provisions for individual faculty growth in the

TABLE 22

FRINGE BENEFIT PROGRAM IN THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

17	A.	Social Security
17	B.	Other Retirement
13		TIAA-CREF
16	C.	Group Hospitalization
14	D.	Major Medical
9	E.	Accident Insurance
11	F.	Life Insurance
4	G.	Health Service Provided
15	H.	Reduction or Waiver of Tuition for Dependents of Faculty
13	I.	Sick Leaves With Pay
1	J.	Provide Housing
2	K.	Loan Fund Available for Sizable Purchases
11	L.	Significant Recreation Facilities Provided

various academic areas. Table 23 enumerates different methods of providing for such growth. It is rather disappointing to point out that out of a total full-time teaching faculty of 1530, there were only sixteen (16) sabbaticals and thirty-four (34) non-paid leaves granted during the 1967-68 school year. The most widely used method of promoting faculty growth was providing the faculty member with travel funds to attend academic and professional meetings. This was usually done by allocating funds to a department or division head to distribute to other faculty members. Some institutions mentioned they encouraged faculty to earn higher degrees by granting financial assistance for summer study.

TABLE 23

PROVISIONS FOR FACULTY GROWTH IN THE INDEPENDENT SECTOR

9[a]	A.	Sabbaticals
16		Granted in Past Year
10	B.	Non-Paid Leaves
34		Granted in Past Year
5	C.	Funds for Research (Institutional Only)
7	D.	Payment of Professional Membership Fees
16	E.	Travel Expenses to Professional Meetings

[a] Number of institutions granting the provision.

At the end of each interview with the chief academic officer, he was asked what he considered the most critical problems in the area of curriculum, faculty, and instruction. Some of the comments follow:

> In the area of curriculum, one of the greatest problems is to implement the present structure which allows for interdisciplinary programs. The development of these programs takes considerable time and effort. In the area of instruction, one of the most interesting and difficult things to do is to develop new ways of imaginatively using time.
>
> In both of the above areas one of the most difficult things to do is to design curriculum and instructional options which recognize the psychological knowledge that we know about learning, and the fact that there is a broad range of individual differences in learning. Hence, any program should have a fair range of options for students to learn in different ways.
>
> The continual problem with faculty is to select and identify vigorous and outstanding teachers.

Another dean comments:

> We will survive only if our leadership continues to realize our goals and purposes and does not try to expand to what we are not. In that light, our faculty could eventually price us out of existence. We have a mission of educating the average student.

> Why can't we articulate more among all institutions in the state? Why does it have to be only the presidents when articulation does take place? Other administrators have problems also.

Finally, a dean mentioned that primarily the problems boiled down to money. Then he commented quite philosophically about the future educational problems of the liberal arts college. He said there is a "seeming breakdown of consensus of what is a liberally educated person. One cannot fall back on the "Harvard Report" today. The outbreak of McLuhanism has cast a great deal of doubt and it is forcing us to rethink our objectives."

If it could be summarized with few words, the problems in the area of curriculum, instruction, and faculty seem to be the lack of money to keep pace with the advancements in higher education; the ability to recruit a staff prepared to communicate and educate the students found on each campus with their differing needs and abilities; and lack of facilities designed to cope with future advancements in higher education.

IV. COOPERATIVE EFFORTS

One of the critical elements in the determination of future cooperative efforts is an understanding of the proper relationship between the public and independent sectors of higher education in Florida. Before master planning can be initiated it must be determined what is considered common ground between the two sectors. The presidents and chairmen of the independent sector were asked what they thought was the proper relationship between their institution and the various sectors concerned with higher education in the State. With few exceptions, the presidents and chairmen felt that the proper relationship with other independent institutions should always be one of maximum cooperation where possible. As one president stated, "We have the common problem of survival. Therefore, we should share facilities and purchasing, students and faculty. It is essential that we have close ties; in fact, our uniqueness can best be publicized through cooperation." Another president stressed, "Florida needs excellence in higher education and we feel we can offer it. We can serve independent higher education by doing what we can [do] best." A chairman summarized his feeling about the proper relationship with other private institutions by stating:

> We maintain excellent relationships with the other private, independent, accredited, degree-granting institutions in Florida. We are active members of the Independent Colleges and Universities in Florida and through this statewide association, participate in many public relations programs designed to create a greater appreciation of the private institutions in our state. Here in the county we work closely and coordinate academic programs and cooperate in certain areas of curriculum with other colleges. We are helping one institution in particular in its effort to establish its academic program.

When questioning turned to the proper relationship between the independent sector and the various state agencies,[1] varied responses were given. Several presidents felt that most agencies did not know their (independent) institutions existed. One president commented, "Generally, they don't think about us very often . . . just look at the brochures. We need to show them our contribution. How can you talk about higher education in Florida and leave out the independent sector?" Another president mentioned that he had never met a representative from the State Planning Commission or the Development Commission. There was a definite feeling that more effort could be made by the various state agencies to visit the campuses and determine for themselves the contribution made by the independent sector. "The role of the private institution," a president said, "just can't be divorced from statewide planning."

There was strong feeling that more cooperative two-way communication could be established between the Board of Regents and the independent sector. One president said that the reason for a lack of high level communication between the two sectors was probably due to the fact that the Board was so large and had so many problems of its own that they have not yet had time or shown an inclination for coördination. A few presidents stressed that they already have existing cooperative arrangements with various state universities. Additionally, they emphasized that independent and public college and university presidents meet together as members of the Florida Association of Colleges and Universities to discuss matters on an ad hoc basis. They further indicated that few matters of substance ever resulted from such meetings.

---

[1] State Planning Commission, State Development Commission, and other related departments and agencies.

One president pointed out that insufficient information was used to support the establishment of a new institution in the immediate geographical area. Another mentioned that it was time for the University System to inform the independent sector of the new programs the State was planning to establish at the various institutions because "we hate to move in an area where we will be put out of business." As one president said, "The Board of Regents doesn't know we exist and doesn't care. It feels its job is to educate people and if anybody else is in the business it doesn't care." One chairman summarized administrative thinking on the matter very well:

> I believe that there is room for improvement in terms of proper relationships between our institution and the State University System. For example, it would be most unfortunate if the State University System saw fit to establish certain academic, particularly graduate, programs which exactly duplicate the educational resources already developed at our institution. There is no need for the citizens of Florida to assume the burden to establish similar programs under the State University System.

The independent sector generally felt that the relationship between the junior colleges and their institutions had improved greatly in the past ten years. The independent sector had begun to recognize the vast reservoir of students that could be potentially enrolled in independent colleges and universities. As one president stated:

> We have a specific interest in that we want more junior college graduates making up for the attrition rate in the lower division. I hope we can get away from the rigidity of counting courses and so forth. I would like to see more flexibility to find good people no matter where they are in their development.

Currently, there are independent institutions who accept the junior college graduate upon presentation of a transcript verifying the completion of a college parallel program.

The majority of all administrators interviewed were quite positive in their feeling about the establishment of more formal statewide communication such as that found in some state master plans for higher education. Although most presidents and chairmen had not thought a great deal about the formal structure of a master planning effort, suggestions were made that may prove helpful. For instance, one president commented, "I think it would help if we understood what contributions the private school can make. I think it ought to be done before the fact rather than after the fact." A chairman stressed that the place of private education should be resolved. "We should determine the number of students who could be accomodated in private colleges and declare a moratorium on the building of public universities when private facilities are available."

Another college president pointed out:

> Every institution ought to be appraised of the planning effort of other institutions. Private institutions ought to be protected from hasty growth of the public sector. For instance, it would not be right for the State to ride roughshod over us. The State has an obligation to offer a program here [referring to a particular geographical area] but it should look around at what is being offered elsewhere.

It was the consensus that it would be highly desirable to have a statewide master planning group. Both public and private institutions should be involved and the educational needs of the State should receive prime consideration. Furthermore, it was stressed that such a master planning body should be kept out of the political arena. If such a board was established its principal duty would be to make recommendations based on intensive research. These recommendations would come from discussion and research into the areas of fiscal problems, physical expansion, establishment of new institutions, curriculum and instruction, and student enrollment and recruitment.

2

Furthermore, it was recommended by the majority of those interviewed that the powers of such a planning board "should be restricted so as not to jeopardize the autonomy of any individual institution whether within the State University System, the Junior College System, or among the independent institutions in Florida." This, of course, would make its powers basically advisory and recommendatory.

The presidents and the chairmen were also asked to comment on what they felt would be the proper membership for such a master planning body. Many recommendations were made; however, most people interviewed said they had not done a lot of prior thinking on this particular phase of master planning. Most agreed that the "Board" should be representative of all types of higher education in the State. The question of appointment of board members brought three general responses. Some administrators favored a statewide board appointed by the Governor; some would like the Commissioner of Education to designate the membership; others suggested that the State Planning Commission should be charged with the responsibility to coordinate and appoint the master planning board. Broadly speaking, the administrators suggested that membership should come from the state university system, junior college system, private colleges and universities, citizens-at-large representing business and industry, and legislative members. However, one president cautioned that the planning board "should be made up of people at the academic dean's level simply because if the proposals are going to be carried out it will have to be carried out at the 'grass roots' level: the faculty." Another cautioned that if master planning "means control, I'm against it. If it becomes rigid, I'm against it. Nonetheless, there ought to be a forum where the needs of the State can be looked at and if master planning is sharply defined it might accomplish something." One suggestion was made offering an idea that would precede a formal master planning board:

> Three trustees from each institution should meet with the Chancellor and the State Board of Regents. This meeting should be called by the Commissioner of Education or the Governor at a place and time they designate. They should sit down and have a common understanding about the future. There would be no presidents and no deans present.

If a master planning board is created in the State of Florida, it was suggested that an executive staff should be supported by all participating parties. As one chairman stated, "This staff would carry on ongoing projects and meet regularly with the master planning board who would set policy and determine programs and planning procedures to be followed."

In summary, better communication at all levels was vigorously stressed by the independent sector. It was somewhat disappointing that more thought had not gone into specific proposals concerning initiating and creating methods that would improve statewide planning of all higher education in Florida.

V. PUBLIC IMAGE

The responsibility to create the right impression concerning the mission and goals of independent higher education in Florida is taken quite seriously by the various institutions. Table 24 points out that there are full-time public relations offices located in thirteen institutions. Those that mentioned they did not have a full-time staff indicated public relations was usually the responsibility of the president. One president described the goals of his public relations effort as a projection "of a favorable image of the institution through mass communication media and creative programs which include public speaking by staff, faculty, and students, newspaper releases, and acting as official host to the campus by conducting tours and greeting guests." Another stated his goals more philosophically: "To exploit the unusual strengths of our program, demonstrating to our various publics the values we adhere to, the worth of this effort to them, and the ever present need to understand the nature of change in a context of higher education." One president cautioned that it was his institution's

TABLE 24

FULL-TIME PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICES

Yes	No	No Response
13	5	2

objective to reveal to the general public and university community the "true" image of the university. He said:

> I think it is dangerous to create an image (which implies a facade) as such. It is very difficult to spread the word. For example, we have so many people moving in and out of our area that when we feel we have educated the people, another 10,000 people have moved in. Our public relations office has to constantly educate the public in the varied opportunities and aspirations of the university.

One college president very candidly said that it was the goal of his public relations office "to create good will toward the university and good wills!" In general, it appeared that the presidents wanted their public relations effort to project the correct image of their respective institutions.

Very few private institutions in Florida have made any formal studies to determine their "image" in the local community and/or the State of Florida. Three colleges had professional studies done for them and, in one case, the president remarked, "I was shocked and surprised that the community didn't know too much about us. We feel that since the study we have done things to change this image." The results from another study proved the institution's public relations effort fell far short of administrative expectations even though the study pointed out that the public respected the institution's high academic standards. A third institution had a New York concern write back to local businessmen in a blind letter, asking them what they thought of the institution. "Quite generally the reaction was outstanding," the president remarked. Many presidents felt that they did not have the resources or their institutions were too young to make a formal study of their public image.

When the chairmen were asked what type of institutional image was being projected the responses were quite varied. One chairman said:

> I think our image locally is one of a highly innovative institution which some people accept and support and of which some of our more conservative element are afraid. We share with other institutions the image modern youth is projecting. I don't feel we have any more instances of student trouble than any other college but we have some divided feeling in this community. Nationally, however, the little things do not reach any proportion and, therefore, the national image is probably better.

Another chairman pointed out that even though the local community sometimes felt "hostile" toward the students, the people were "interested in improving the financial and economic condition of the area."[1] One chairman, spending most of his life in the community where the college is located, said, "I feel that the image the college projects is extremely good. The community has great pride in the college, recognizes its prestige, and cooperates readily. We like to feel the image is equally good over Florida."

It was decided to follow-up the questions asked of the president and chairman concerning the local image by asking the fiscal officer if the local community contributed financially to the institution's well-being. This would serve as an excellent indication of the support given to the local independent institutuion. One fiscal officer pointed out that "apart from church giving, businesses and individuals have accounted for approximately $1,500,000 over the past five years." Another stated the local financial support was "exceptionally good the past year or two with a total of $200,000 in gifts. The local community is generous." A few others stated that, without local aid, the institution would not be where it is today. However, in some areas of the state the local community played a relatively minor role in support. These institutions relied on individual giving from outside the area or from church groups. It was interesting to note one comment from a chief fiscal officer concerning local giving, "National giving has given very well over the years; however, local companies, with the exception of one, have given practically nothing."

---

[1] One institution made an economic impact study of its local area and found in 1967-68 it spent $17.3 million in goods and services and it was projected for the current fiscal year at $19 million.

Corporations, communities, and other interested parties do not usually give money to causes they do not understand. It was decided to find out if there was any confusion in the minds of Florida residents concerning the function of independent higher education. These perceptions were made by the presidents and chairmen interviewed:

> Indeed, there is great misunderstanding if not confusion. I think there is vast misunderstanding of the role. People whose orientation is toward the public institutions don't know what we are talking about. Oh, they know that 'X' is run by the Roman Catholics, 'Y' by the Methodists, and 'Z' by the Baptists but they don't see how it fits into the total picture. They don't really understand that without private gifts, independent institutions would dry up and blow away.

Another administrator pointed out that "confusion comes out of ignorance. Until we published facts about private higher education, very little was known. Even the Kiplinger Letter failed to mention independent higher education in an article about Florida higher education." However, one president said that this confusion is:

> more of less normal. How does the public become expert on the U.N., tax structure, and so forth? From where I've been Floridians seem to be on their toes as far as education is concerned. Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, Inc., [I.C.U.F.] has been helpful. The next step is something implicit in this study. How do we get an approach for a comprehensive plan of higher education, private and public?

One administrator pointed to the fact that we needed a major campaign to keep people in Florida. "There is a tremendous need for our schools to be first class if we want to continue to attract the brain-oriented industry." Confusion seems to enter the picture because "there are those who have serious questions as to whether the private institutions of higher education can or should survive, but most knowledgeable people believe that the private college is an indispensable factor in the field of advanced education." Another continues, "I don't think the public generally appreciates the flexibility and the ability to meet changing conditions perhaps more rapidly than public institutions."

Interviews with selected administrators revealed three major findings. (1) There have been and are public relations efforts in nearly all independent institutions. These efforts are concentrating on reflecting a positive image of Florida private higher education. However, (2) there seem to be three types of independent institutions reflected in the minds of Floridians. One would be a "safe" college where the students do not cause any trouble; another would be the "rebel" college where town-grown relationships have grown thin because of the "liberal" attitude of the institution; the last type is the "neutral" college. People know it is located in the area but they do not take a positive or negative interest in it. (3) There seems to be a lack of understanding in the minds of Floridians concerning the functions of independent higher education. Most administrators thought the citizens of this State placed all higher education in the same category.

VI. PHYSICAL FACILITIES

This section will examine the extent and depth of the master planning effort concerning physical facilities on the part of independent institutions of higher learning.[1] The private colleges will be grouped as one in the hope that a comprehensive picture of facilities planning can be presented.

Master Planning

Master planning for physical growth in colleges and universities has become a popular and useful technique in this country since World War II. The trend has been felt on the private college campuses of this State. Table 25 shows that, of the twenty colleges visited, sixteen indicated that they have a master plan for future physical growth. When asked what years the master planning covered, the usual response was ten years; however, there were master plans extending to 1980[2] and others that

TABLE 25

MASTER PLANNING IN FLORIDA INDEPENDENT COLLEGES

Yes	No	No Response
16	3	1

---

[1] Reference should be made to the extensive and comprehensive Florida Higher Education Facilities Study: 1968, submitted to the Florida State Commission of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

[2] One institution presented a theoretical plan, developed by an architect, that extended for 100 years. Since it was considered financially impossible to carry out, the plan has been abandoned.

were nearing completion with a subsequent plan in the process of development. The presidents did point out that their plans were very flexible and could change from time to time to meet the fluctuation of existing variables. One president said very candidly, "We had a master plan that was outdated the day it was put on paper." This institution is currently in the process of developing a more meaningful plan for physical growth.

It should be noted that each campus goes about facilities planning in a different way. One president noted that architects, curricular programs, and student enrollment were the necessary variables to consider. He expressed this as the "reality of numbers," i.e., what is now on the campus, what should be on the campus, and what are the educational objectives of the institution. Some campuses used consultants constantly while others felt that consultants come to an institution with too many preconceived notions that actually hinder the expression of a campus philosophy of education vis-à-vis physical growth. Most, however, felt that in any kind of development the most important consideration is the curriculum. Facilities must arise out of the program to be offered, i.e., "the functional utility of housing the program offered by the faculty."

Another president pointed out the need for anticipating the changing philosophy of higher education. For example, he mentioned that his institution was planning to relax the rule that all students must live in dormitories. He said, "I don't see residential giving way to non-residential campuses but I do see dorms giving way to group living and new types of habitat." Planning must be made far in advance for it would not be financially feasible to be tied down to a thirty or forty year mortgage on a building that would not be functional or acceptable to the student in the year 2000.

Master planning is of little value unless it helps to direct an institution toward its educational goals in physical expansion. A good indication of the worth of a master planning effort was detected when the presidents were asked if their projected growth of the past ten years met expectations and needs. Consideration must be made of the tremendous amounts of money made available through the federal government, especially the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

About half of the presidents indicated that their "real" physical growth actually kept pace with the projected growth of the late 1950's and the 1960's. Some comments from those who felt that their projections were not realized ranged from "Our growth was not projected or anticipated," to "[we] had to work from month to month. We started with practically nothing and had to build slowly." Another president summed up the plight of master planning by saying, "Our physical growth is ahead, our faculty salaries ahead, but our student enrollment has not kept pace." On the more optimistic side, "We made a projection six or seven years ago for '68-'69 and we hit it right on the money." Another mentioned that the past ten years had been the institution's best.

One cannot generalize about the worth of master planning unless it is taken within the context of each institution. All the presidents stressed the need for a functional plan for facility growth but, as mentioned previously, the range of sophistication in the approach to the effort remains quite wide. In addition, the most glamorous master plan is but a worthless piece of paper unless careful thought has been given to the type of structures desired and the anticipated sources of revenue needed to meet planning objectives.

The following two tables (Tables 26 and 27) illustrate the tremendous growth anticipated in the independent sector in this State. Including a massive seventy (70) million dollar building program at one institution, the twenty institutions visited anticipate an approximately 186.5 million dollar building program extending to 1980. Contrast that figure with the 131.2 million dollar program of the past decade, the program of forty-one million dollars last year alone, and one realizes the tremendous investment that is being made in brick and mortar in the independent sector. The number of projects and estimated costs for nineteen institutions are listed in Table 26.

TABLE 26

NUMBER AND ESTIMATED COST OF NEW CONSTRUCTION
AND CAMPUS IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS
1968-1980

	Number of Projects	Estimated Costs
1. Instructional	60	$ 50,000,000
2. Research	15	1,500,000
3. General	25	12,000,000
4. Auxiliary	24	10,000,000
5. Residential	34	35,000,000
6. Campus Improvements	continual	10,000,000
Total	158	$118,500,000

Table 27 points out the sources of income that are expected in order to complete the building program by 1980. There is a tremendous

TABLE 27

ANTICIPATED SOURCES OF FUNDS TO FINANCE PHYSICAL EXPANSION 1968-1980

	Instructional	Research	General	Auxiliary	Residential	Campus Improvements
I. Governmental Appropriations						
State Governments						
Local Governments	1		1			1
II. Federal Government Grants						
Title I, HEFA - 63	12	2	1	4		
Title II, HEFA - 63	3		1			
Public Health Service						
National Science Foundation		2				
III. General Obligation Bonds						
Institutional						
Title III, HEFA - 63	9	1	1	2	1	
Municipal Bonds	1				1	
IV. Revenue Bonds						
College Housing Loan Program (HEFA)				3	10	
V. Other						
Pledged Student Building Fees	2	1	1	3	2	1
Gifts and Grants	13	1	8	8	5	10
Current Funds	5		4	3	2	6
Endowment Funds (Invested)			1		1	2
Borrowed from Commercial Sources	5		2	3	3	1
Source Unknown	1		1		1	

reliance on federal money for physical growth.[3] For instance, it would be almost impossible for instructional and residential buildings to be completed without the aid of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. Gifts and grants rank second in importance to the private sector in funding for physical growth. In fact, campus improvements are greatly dependent upon this method of funding. One president pointed out the difficulty of securing gifts and grants for campus improvements when he said it was next to impossible to find someone who would donate $100,000 to improve parking facilities but that he has two or three individuals who would gladly put up a building that was not necessary at the time. Without the federal government, physical expansion in the private sector would come to a virtual standstill unless the State of Florida intervenes in some way to aid the independent institutions.[4]

One might also question the rationale of using student fees or current funds for use in capital outlay expenditures since that money is directly responsible for the educational effort of the institution. When institutions are forced to depend on money heretofore used to support the educational and general effort, it appears to be time for re-examination of the financial capability to support a building program.

---

[3] Reference is made to the Florida Higher Education Facilities Study: 1968, p. 122. Notice that from 1963-67 less than ten (10) percent of building funds came from federal sources. The largest sources were the general revenue and obligation bonds.

[4] Beginning with the fiscal year 1969, Title III funds will be available only for the subsidation of interest on loans borrowed for facilities. This will no doubt hurt some private institutions since they have projected the use of Title III funds as previously used. Other institutions have reached their borrowing limit from commercial sources and without federal loans will have to increase gifts and grants to build.

Campus Planning Participants

In addition to finding out what sources of income would finance the building program it was decided to determine what individuals were involved in the planning of physical facilities. Table 28 shows the frequency of response to a question that asked what type of contribution was made by people close to the campus situation. A range from no

TABLE 28

CONTRIBUTION TO CAMPUS MASTER PLANNING

	Category	Major	Moderate	Slight	No Contribution
A.	Board of Trustees	6	7	2	3
	1. Committees	7	3	1	2
	2. Individuals	12	2	1	-
B.	President	16	2	-	-
C.	Academic Dean	5	2	4	2
D.	Chief Fiscal Officer	11	4	1	-
E.	Development Officer	6	6	2	1
F.	Faculty	3	5	6	2
G.	Students	2	2	10	2
H.	Local Citizens	-	2	8	6
I.	Donors	1	2	8	6
J.	Professional Consultants	6	2	3	5
K.	State Agencies	3	1	0	11
L.	Federal Agencies	4	1	-	11
M.	Others	-	4	2	10

contribution to major contribution was used. It is apparent that three categories emerge as the major contributors to campus planning: the president, individual members of the board of trustees (as opposed to the board as a whole or committees of the board), and the chief fiscal officer. Conversely, it becomes apparent that the students, faculty, and academic dean are not involved in campus planning to the same degree as outside consultants. Another important clarification should be made. Over half of the presidents indicated that there was no contribution on the part of federal and State agencies in campus planning but when asked what part the Federal Higher Education Programs' office in Tallahassee played, they almost unanimously mentioned that that office greatly aided in the preparation of proposals for Title I and VI-A grants of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. In addition, the presidents did not see the donors as a threat to campus planning once their gifts were secured. This is encouraging since funds must be made available for the most important projects and only those people associated with the campus can determine these needs.

It is of interest to note the type of consultants who have been involved in campus planning. If one could make a generalization, consultants used fall into four different categories: educational, fund-raising, public relations survey consultants, and architects. There are examples in this State where one architect (or firm) is responsible for the planning of the entire campus. However, most presidents felt that more than one voice was needed in the determination of physical needs for a campus.

Plant Utilization

The presidents were asked how they utilized their physical plant to maximum advantage in meeting their educational objectives. Table 29 is a response to such a question. Out of eighteen institutions responding to this point one notices that a great deal of improvement is needed in the area of institutional research, and, where possible, in the cooperative sharing of facilities.

TABLE 29

RESOURCE UTILIZATION OF PHYSICAL PLANT[a]

7	A.	Use of management information systems and procedures. (Institutional Research)
10	B.	Maintenance of utilization records.
6	C.	Computer scheduling.
7	D.	Sharing facilities with other institutions.
2	E.	Other

[a] Number indicates institutions using technique listed.

A defense was made by nearly every president who did not use computer scheduling. They felt their institutions were too small to make it financially feasible to use this technique. Sharing facilities seems to be a problem of geography but the presidents did indicate more study of this possibility should be made. Finally, one institution indicated that they relied on a "Committee on Plant Utilization" which met regularly to discuss problems of plant usage. Included were members of the board of trustees, students, faculty and administrators.

Reference must be made to the Florida Higher Education Facilities Study: 1968, to notice that through 1972-73, the independent colleges seem to have at the undergraduate level sufficient classroom space, teaching labs, offices, study areas, and supporting space. Their needs lie in residential, general, and special use space.[5] This may indicate that the State of Florida may take advantage of the additional classroom space for the commuter student, or, if the dormitory needs can be fulfilled by 1972-73, a larger number of Florida residents would be able to reside on campus and attend the institutions.[6]

One of the major objectives of this study was to determine the perceptions of the administrators concerning state involvement in the utilization and strengthening of the independent sector of higher education. When the presidents were asked if the State of Florida could assist in planning for physical facilities expansion, the range of response was varied. However, the majority felt that there were ways in which the State could assist. The minority position felt that "State aid in planning for physical expansion might conceivably lead to State control." A much stronger statement came from another president, "I don't believe in this [state aid in physical expansion]. As soon as you talk about this then you have State control. People can't make it work. There is bias and politics. The best way the State could help would be to get a realistic overview and stop duplication of effort." The clear majority of the presidents felt differently, even though one other mentioned that independent colleges were just too small to be of any interest to many state agencies. "They don't even know we exist." Several felt that the best thing the State could do would be to establish a tax-exempt bonding authority of which private institutions may avail themselves. "We could get some financing at a lower rate than commercial sources and it would not be a gift or grant from the State." Grants were suggested even though it was generally thought that the financial pressure on the legislature to fully support the Regents and junior college building program would be taken care of before this kind of attention could be given to the private sector.

---

[5] As defined in Higher Education Facilities Classification and Inventory Procedures Manual, U.S.O.E.

[6] The total figure presented in the Florida Higher Education Facilities Study: 1968, may force one to overgeneralize the capacity of individual independent institutions. However, in planning for the future of higher education in this State all possibilities should be explored. See the section on enrollment, for information.

The establishment of new institutions and centers is a major concern of many administrators. The need for immediate consultation in physical expansion was apparent from the campus visits. One president explained how a master plan for physical expansion could help. He stressed that the area is putting:

> . . . a lot of pressure on us to open a center but should we plan to do this or not? One major unknown is would a nearby state institution come in, set up shop right beside us, and offer the same thing at half-price? They won't tell us. Here is where a master plan would help. They could tell us 'yes' and we wouldn't begin to think about a service program for the area.

Another administrator offered a self-admittedly "bizarre" suggestion. "The State could establish a junior college on this campus [there is no junior college near the area] and we could provide the facilities and services to the people in the county. Why can't it be done? We could start with an evening program and the State and county provide the funds."

In summarizing the section on physical facilities it is important to note that very serious and extensive planning is taking place in the independent sector of higher education in Florida. There is great belief that a building that is not needed could easily destroy the financial stability of an institution. New facilities are tremendous investments for the private sector. The study director had an opportunity to see master plans that were extremely sophisticated on the one hand and very crude, over-simplified plans on the other.

It appears necessary that more people should be involved in campus planning in the private sector. Reference is especially made to those closely related to the instructional effort: deans, faculty, and students. They could offer much to campus planning, particularly in the small institution where it is practical to seek the advice of those mentioned. Furthermore, more use of institutional research should be made. Many presidents fear the additional cost of adding a person familiar with such procedures but:

> . . . in the face of virtually unlimited demands and constrained resources, poor choices on how to allocate scarce resources among competing demands results in accomplishing less of the organization's objectives than would be possible given better choices. The real measure of the losses involved is not the 'wasted dollars,' but the forgone benefits from the programs which were not funded (i.e., the opportunity costs of the resources which were misallocated).[7]

The ability to make the proper decision with the proper information at the proper time may be the difference between the viable and the closed independent institution of higher learning in the future.

With the facilities crisis upon the State in every phase of higher learning the private sector must not be ignored as a possible outlet to relieve pressure by maximum utilization of their existing and projected space. A serious review of the Florida Higher Education

---

[7] John Keller, "Need for Efficient Resource Allocation Decision Making" (paper presented at Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems Seminar, Tallahassee, Fla., April, 1969).

Facilities Study: 1968, should be made by all concerned with the future of private higher education in this State. There is no question that certain types of facilities are needed and since money has become such a precious commodity, only those buildings that are absolutely necessary for planned and stable growth should be undertaken.

VII. FINANCIAL STABILITY

Financial stability is the most important variable in the determination of the future of independent higher education in Florida. Many studies dealing with this subject have used the words critical, impending crisis, and so forth to describe the financial plight of independent higher education in a given state. The investigator agrees with the above adjectives to describe the condition in general; however, this study approached the problem from a slightly different perspective. It was found that each institution visited had similar problems. Yet, it was discovered that financing an institution is an individual matter and no two private institutions in this State are exactly alike in their approach to financial solvency. What follows are some basic comparisons among individual institutions to determine the future financial direction of this important sector of higher education.

In order to conduct a detailed analysis of financial conditions, five institutions were selected at random from the twenty studied.[1] The independent institutions in Florida presented budgets for the 1968-69 school year totaling $94,000,000 in educational and general expenditures.[2]

---

[1] The reader may wish to refer to Appendix A for a comparison with the other institutions that submitted financial analyses. The sample used will give the reader an opportunity to examine the differences and similarities that exist in the financial operations of a variety of independent institutions of higher learning in Florida.

[2] This does not include auxiliaries (room, board, etc.), student aid, or capital outlay expenditures.

To further substantiate the rationale of examining institutions individually rather than generally, it should be pointed out that the estimates for educational and general expenditures range from less than $500,000 per institution to over $59,000,000. This investigator feels that it is more important to determine how an institution spends its money rather than how much money it allocates in dollars and cents. Table 30 examines the income and expenditures for the five institutions over a twenty year period, 1959-1981.[3] All but one of these five institutions appear to be living within its educational and general income for the present fiscal year. However, of the twenty institutions, five indicated deficits for the present fiscal year. Upon further examination of this problem it was found that if the auxiliaries did not make up the difference the money had to be borrowed from commercial sources or a last minute donor(s) had to be found to literally "bail out" the institution. Tables 31 through 35 present a more detailed account of the educational and general budgets, pointing out the percentage of income by various categories and expenditures by function.

Income

The reliance on tuition and fees for basic support of the independent institution is clearly evident from an examination of the following tables. The present range (1968-69) is from fifty-eight (58) percent of the total income to ninety (90) percent. However, the future of the independent institution clearly rests on the ability of the

---

[3] In order to allow maximum flexibility, it was decided to present the budgets in three categories: past, present, and future. Four of the five institutions reported above used the following three dates: 1959-60, 1968-69, and 1980-81. The fifth used the 1964-65 school year as its past reference.

TABLE 30

STATUS OF INSTITUTIONAL INCOME AND EXPENDITURES 1959-1980

	Past	Present	Future
Institution "A"			
Income	$ 507,091	$1,512,650	$3,170,000
Expenditures	430,766	1,422,029	2,810,000
Institution "B"			
Income	1,574,672	3,029,191	4,972,500
Expenditures	1,525,039	2,806,261	4,586,625
Institution "C"			
Income	926,078	3,095,300	6,890,000
Expenditures	862,766	3,032,552	6,513,000
Institution "D"			
Income	981,202	2,714,900	5,833,071
Expenditures	898,074	2,342,602	5,733,937
Institution "E"			
Income	502,318	1,502,791	2,278,500
Expenditures	482,111	1,543,380[a]	2,378,350[b]

[a] Deficit for current fiscal year.

[b] Deficit anticipated for 1980-81.

institution to raise tuition income since the lower figure increases to sixty-eight (68) percent and the upper figure to ninety-one (91) percent by 1980-81. Gifts and grants, long the foundation of independent higher education financing, appear to be on the decline in this State. One institution reported that thirty-seven (37) percent of its income came from gifts and grants, but it predicts this will drop to a total of

TABLE 31

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL BUDGET

	Institution "A"		
	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	59	58	68
Gifts and Grants	31	37	21
Endowment	3	0	6
Government Appropriations	0	0	5
Other	7	5	0
Total	100	100	100
Expenditures			
Administration and General	36	12	10
Instructional	41	52	50
Library	3	7	9
Physical Plant	20	14	18
Other	0	15	13
Total	100	100	100

twenty-one (21) percent of the institution's income by 1980-81. In fact, many of the institutions reported that they can only rely on ten (10) percent or less of their income from gifts and grants by 1980. The third category, historically fruitful for the independent institution, is

TABLE 32

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL BUDGET

	Institution "B"		
	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	84	68	71
Gifts and Grants	10	17	15
Endowment	3	12	10
Government Appropriations	0	1	1
Other	3	2	3
Total	100	100	100
Expenditures			
Administration and General	18	18	14
Instructional	43	41	54
Library	5	5	5
Physical Plant	24	20	14
Other	10	16	13
Total	100	100	100

endowment. However, Florida's independent sector has little to show in the way of endowments. As will be shown later (Table 39), the dollar amount of endowments is hardly worth mentioning when considering the financial demands placed on the institutions. One exception is apparent.

TABLE 33

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL BUDGET

	Institution "C"		
	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	71	90	83
Gifts and Grants	7	6	4
Endowment	1	2	9
Government Appropriations	19	1	2
Other	2	1	2
Total	100	100	100
Expenditures			
Administration and General	27	15	12
Instructional	49	61	62
Library	12	5	4
Physical Plant	12	13	16
Other	0	6	6
Total	100	100	100

For example, one institution reported that for this fiscal year (1968-69) endowment contributed twelve (12) percent of the educational and general income. However, most institutions follow the pattern set by the other four examples. The two remaining categories, government appropriations

TABLE 34

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL BUDGET

	Institution "D"		
	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	84	87	91
Gifts and Grants	7	6	6
Endowment	1	1	1
Government Appropriations	6	5	2
Other	2	1	0
Total	100	100	100
Expenditures			
Administration and General	35	39	25
Instructional	44	44	62
Library	3	3	3
Physical Plant	18	14	10
Other	0	0	0
Total	100	100	100

and other income, hold little promise for the private institutions of this State[4] unless the federal government and the State of Florida begin to

---

[4] With the exception of two institutions that depend a great deal on research contracts and grants, the majority of Florida's independent institutions are emphasizing undergraduate instruction.

TABLE 35

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL BUDGET

	Institution "E"		
	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	56	73	80
Gifts and Grants	27	19	8
Endowment	6	3	7
Government Appropriations	0	0	0
Other	11	5	5
Total	100	100	100
Expenditures			
Administration and General	26	33	32
Instructional	48	47	50
Library	6	5	4
Physical Plant	12	10	8
Other	8	5	6
Total	100	100	100

take a more active interest in the financial well-being of the four-year independent institution. If the federal government continues to fund according to the categorical and project orientation it now favors and the State government remains pressed to secure minimum funds to support existing public obligations, it appears that there will be no option open to the private sector other than to charge the student to the full amount.

Expenses

Knowing that students supply the funds to operate the independent institution, an examination should follow concerning the way in which the funds are being used. It was found that each institution spends its money a little differently. Formula budgeting, such as the State of Florida uses for publicly supported institutions, is not used. In fact, the allocation for administration and general expense[5] ranges for the present fiscal year from twelve (12) percent at one institution to thirty-nine (39) percent at another. Most of the colleges studied fell into this range; however, one institution reported that fifty-two (52) percent of its expenditures was administration and general.

An examination of the instructional function further reveals variance in the percentage spent by each institution; however, the range does not seem as great. For the institutions listed the low figure was forty-one (41) percent and the high figure sixty-one (61) percent. Additional comparison of the function will follow. Library growth, which is often used as an indicator of improvement, is dependent upon the allocation it is given by those in control of the budget. In Florida most independent institutions spend between three (3) and eight (8) percent of educational and general money on this function. The American Library Association recommends that a minimum of five (5) percent be allocated and many institutions seem to follow this guideline. The final major allocation, operation and maintenance of the physical plant, follows a consistent pattern in Florida with most institutions falling in the ten (10) percent to twenty (20) percent range. Any funds allocated to the function classified "Other" usually indicates that the institution is funding research projects to the indicated amount.

---

[5] American Council on Education definitions were used.

In reviewing the expenditures of institutions very little variance exists in allocations for the library and physical plant. However, institutions differ greatly in their approach to funding the instructional and administrative efforts. Table 36 examines this further by showing the allocation per f.t.e. student using the entire educational and general allocation in the first column and then referring only to the instructional and library allocation. A comparison can be made of three points in time: past, present, and future. Table 36 very poignantly illustrates the fact that private institutions do not spend the same amount for a student's education, and, in fact, for the 1968-69 fiscal year the range is from $1035 per student to $2073 per student. One institution, not among the examples, is currently spending $5140 per student in the total educational and general effort. This emphasis on differences becomes stronger when an analysis is made of the allocation to instruction and library per f.t.e. student. Institution "D" spent $508 per student on instruction whereas Institution "A" allocated $1214 per student for the current fiscal year.

Generalizations are often difficult to make. Although the institution spending the least amount on instructional effort per f.t.e. student is also spending the greatest amount on administration and general expense. The generalization made above is about all that can be said for the moment since the proof that a student is getting a better education at Institution "A" than a student at Institution "D" is less

TABLE 36

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL ALLOCATION
PER F.T.E. STUDENT
1959-1980

	Educational and General	Instruction and Library
Institution "A"		
1959-60	$1012	$ 376
1968-69	2073	1214
Institution "B"		
1959-60	820	387
1968-69	1937	885
1980-81	2548	1516
Institution "C"		
1959-60	833	502
1968-69	1035	859
1980-81	2171	1433
Institution "D"		
1964-65	1003	472
1968-69	1080	508
1980-81	1638	1057
Institution "E"		
1959-60	502	272
1968-69	1629	848
1980-81	1981	1000

than conclusive.[6] That such proof is inconclusive is interesting in view of the fact that Institution "A" spent $2073 per student overall and

---

[6] Earl J. McGrath, ed., Cooperative Long-Range Planning in Liberal Arts Colleges (New York: Teachers College Press, 1964), p. 24. However, the faculty is usually better paid.

$1214 for instruction and library resources, while Institution "D" spent only $1035 for educational and general functions and $508 for instruction and library.

One conclusive statement can be made about the financial plight of Florida's independent institutions. If they are to survive financially they will have to increase their tuition fees substantially in the next ten years. Table 37 indicates the necessary growth needed in tuition if the institutions hope to meet their budget commitments for 1980-81.[7] Compared with the $375 fee charge at state-supported institutions of higher learning,[8] the independent institution cannot and should not compete on a financial basis with the state-supported colleges and universities.

Even though it was pointed out that the amount of money spent per student on instruction and the quality of the instruction given may not be highly correlated, the per-student expenditure for instructional and library functions may be compared with the amount of tuition that the student pays. Historically, it has been said that the student pays very little of his educational cost at the independent college. Table 38 illustrates that the student does, in fact, pay for his instructional and library costs.

With the exception of Institution "A" the student did pay for his instruction. It will be argued that it takes more than faculty pay and library books to run a college and university. This will not be denied. However, it might be appropriate to investigate how the money the student

---

[7] If the examples given seem to indicate an impending financial crisis, please refer to Appendix A where the reader will find institutions predicting tuition charges of $2700, $3100, and $3240 by 1980.

[8] This fee is even lower in many community junior colleges.

TABLE 37

TUITION AND FEE CHARGES AT INDEPENDENT INSTITUTIONS IN FLORIDA PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE

	Tuition[a] and Fees	Room[a] and Board	Percent Increase of Total Student Charges 1959-80
Institution "A"			
1959-60	$ 425	$1000	61
1968-69	1000	1100	
1969-70	1200	1100	
Institution "B"			
1959-60	700	570	160
1968-69	1390	800	
1980-81	2000	1300	
Institution "C"			
1959-60	491	n/a	n/a
1968-69	990	900	
1980-81	1850	1100	
Institution "D"			
1964-65	600	270	222
1968-69	1200	1000	
1980-81	1650	1150	
Institution "E"			
1959-60	360	511	147
1968-69	1000	600	
1980-81	1350	800	

[a] Yearly

invests in an institution is being spent. It may be that too much is being channeled into the operation and maintenance of the physical plant or administrative services or a multitude of other things. The point is made simply because the day is here when an institution must be able to account logically for every function to which it allocates funds.

TABLE 38

INSTRUCTIONAL AND LIBRARY EXPENDITURE COMPARED TO AMOUNT OF STUDENT TUITION, 1968-69
(Per-Student)

	A	B	C	D	E
Instructional Expenditure	$1214	$ 855	$ 859	$ 508	$ 848
Tuition	1000	1390	990	1200	1000

It was mentioned earlier that endowment provided for very little income for the independent sector. Table 39 illustrates why endowment has become just another sub-category of philanthropy in Florida's independent higher education. This category generates so little income at this point in time it is problematic that if inflationary trends continue, the institutions may never be able to call upon their endowment

TABLE 39

ENDOWMENT GROWTH
1959-1969

	A	B	C	D	E
1959	$129,000	$2,133,484	$ 147,463	$584,624	$ 848,021
1969	150,000	8,241,577	1,515,929	767,858	1,373,080

for much financial assistance.[9]

The preceding financial analysis examined only the objective information supplied by each institution participating in the study. The remainder of this section will focus on the perceptions of three administrators concerned with the independent college: the president, the chief fiscal officer, and the chairman of the board of trustees. Generally, the president seemed to present the most optimistic picture of the institution's financial future; the chief fiscal officer presented the most pessimistic picture; and the chairman usually presented a realistic picture.

President's Reactions

The presidents, when asked what changes they thought would be necessary in their educational and general income in order to carry out successfully the goals of their institution, replied that they felt the need to increase tuition to a certain point that would not jeopardize attracting the clientele. One president pointed out that if inflationary trends continue as they have since World War II, raising tuitions will not be a problem. Another felt that there will be a limit on the charges that can be placed on a student and forcefully stated, "We've got to have help from the federal government. Federal grants [for specific projects] are nice but they don't relieve our financial burdens. Until there is direct aid we cannot rely on the federal government for real help." Several leaders pointed to an increased endowment that would generate additional income. As previously pointed out, spectacular growth will be necessary if endowments will, in fact, generate the kind of income necessary for future commitments. A few presidents saw a great need for better investment plans and for new ways to secure funds. For instance, closer management of an endowment portfolio at one institution produced significant results in a very short time.

---

[9] This was the general pattern evident at all institutions. The race to build an endowment that is worthwhile and profitable seems almost beyond reach of those institutions in this country that did not build substantial endowments prior to World War II or shortly thereafter. Reference is made to the Chronicle of Higher Education, III, No. 15, (April 7, 1969), 8.

Gifts and grants will have to increase, according to most presidents, if their institutions are to remain stable. Some presidents pointed to the relatively young age of their alumni and indicated optimism when asked if they hoped for an increase in significant contributions from successful graduates. As one president pointed out, "For the size of the institution we have, one major gift can make all the difference in the world between stability and crisis."

When asked if they thought private higher education would reach a point where tuition charges would be too high to attract clientele, most replies indicated that the independent institution must examine its reasons for being in existence. One president mentioned, "Unless we get a better understanding of private higher education, we could price ourselves out of existence." Another mentioned that the future financial condition of private higher education was essentially tied in with what each institution decided to do with its resources. All felt that open competition with the state-supported institutions was the surest road to financial crisis open to them. One president very realistically summarized that student tuition must be raised, gifts and grants cultivated where they could be found, endowments raised if possible, and then hope the State and the federal appropriations would increase.

The majority of presidents indicated no fear in accepting federal funds. Asked if the institution could survive without government funds, one president said:

> Survive without federal and state aid? Probably not! Not with the ideals we have set for this institution. Maybe our board of trustees would not agree because they are willing to do certain things for the school but the federal government has begun such a program of aid and they will not discontinue aid.

Another president said, "I think it is inevitable that the federal government will have to play an increasing role in the support of private higher education." How much of an increasing role? Some felt that Alan Pifer's prediction that fifty (50) percent of the income for the independent institution will be needed from the federal government was unrealistically high, especially in the next decade or two. Nearly everyone felt that federal grants must continue for student aid and building programs but hesitated to predict the effect of federal grants for operating expenses.

A few presidents felt the approach to federal investment in private higher education must be made philosophically. The federal government, it was pointed out, must decide whether or not it wants a dual system of higher education or a federal system of higher education with a central ministry of education, much like Europe. Either system, however, will depend on federal support. Another president mentioned:

> It would be desirable if private industry and gifts would provide the money. This is impossible in our day. Many private interests are turning to other things, draining off millions of potential dollars from private higher education. Thus, I think that the trend to federal government support is worthy and here to stay.

The stability of federal funding was questioned. One president cautioned:

> If the federal government would get into long-term support and allow the independents to remain special purpose and innovative, it would be fine. But the trouble is you plan year to year and the appropriations are up and down every year, a very unstable way of financing institutions of higher learning.

Institutional autonomy did not seem to be a vital question. In fact, only one president felt that his institution's autonomy was being challenged. Most presidents hoped that if State aid would be forthcoming they would pattern the method of determining eligibility for aid after the federal system (that is, the accreditation approach to eligibility).

Since federal aid is here to stay, the methods and patterns of support it develops for the future will have a very definite bearing on the financial security of Florida's independent institutions.

The presidents felt that the State government could play a very important role in the financial stability of their institutions. They stressed five approaches to state funding of private higher education. The most often mentioned method was the expansion of the current Regents scholarship program into an overall "State Tuition Grant Program." There were many suggestions concerning amounts to be granted to the student but the rationale, in most cases, was patterned after the response:

> Every student who attends a state institution gets an eighty percent grant-in-aid. I would hate to turn to out-of-state students based solely on the competition as a result of the great difference in tuition. We wish to continue our service to the residents of the State . . . but if the State continues to build campuses adjacent to us and charges one-fifth or one-sixth of what we have to charge, this is hardly competition. We will compete on any other grounds but we can't compete with tuition charges.

The majority of administrators felt that the only way to avoid the possibility of State control of private institutions in matters of funding would be to give the money directly to the student and let the student decide which institution he would like to attend. There is always the possibility that there are students in this State who would rather be in attendance at a private institution rather than a state-supported institution but because of financial reasons the option is not open to him. The presidents of the private sector would like to see the option open for a student to make a choice between independent and state-supported institutions.

A second popular approach to state funding is also mentioned in the section on physical facilities. A few presidents expressed the hope that a State Bonding Authority would be established whereby the independent institutions could avail themselves of tax free bonds for the construction of physical facilities. Another approach mentioned was contractual agreements between the State and the independent institution to offer specialized programs. This approach would be based on a similar program now established between the State and the Medical School of the University of Miami. As one president stated, "The State doesn't build highways and buildings. They contract with others. No one seems to complain about this arrangement . . . . why can't we do this for education." Another president suggested that certain private institutions could have provided programs in specialized areas where the State has recently developed new programs. As he stated:

> We would never have replaced State programs in certain areas, such as oceanography and public administration, but we could have provided some help. I don't think each institution should have to offer everything. Why would a State institution have to offer a new program if an existing independent institution could handle the demand for such a program?

There was one other suggestion that deserves merit--yet caution--since the State is currently burdened with financial problems. It is concerned with outright construction grants to private institutions. This plan would be similar to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Title I and II, which provides for grants for construction. The idea behind the plan suggested would be to require the institution to seek a third of the money from Title I or II funds of the H.E.F.A., a third of the funds from philanthropy, and a third from the State.

One president offered a unique suggestion in the approach to funding the private sector. He said, "The State could help by making incentive money available on an unrestricted basis—or for physical facilities. I think the State would be making a grave mistake if it forced the private institutions to become like state institutions." However, the same president strongly pointed out:

> The problems of private and state higher education are different. The reason private higher education is in such financial difficulty is because they have tried to assume the role that rightfully belongs to the state. So I feel that it's the state's responsibility to raise the educational level of its citizens. It's the role of the private institution to design itself for special purposes and provide for special areas and enterprises. This will be the emerging role for [financial] survival.
>
> The liberal arts college which attempts to sustain itself on tuition to serve the general population of a specific area is going to go out of business because this is the role of the state colleges and junior colleges. Every youngster has the inherit right to attend school according to his ability. I think the liberal arts college can cater to an elite group . . . although I find many state institutions attempting to become elite institutions.
>
> Private higher education can do a job for the state in more costly areas where the state can't afford to assume this role. There has to be a dichotomy of interest. Finances must be arranged so that each must perform in its own area.

Fiscal Officer's Reactions

The chief fiscal officers of the independent sector of Florida's higher education were on the whole quite pessimistic about the future financial condition of their institution. Throughout the study it seemed that they felt they had to be miracle men with the financial problems that plague the private sector. The fiscal officers were asked what type of relationship they anticipated would exist between the State and their institution in the next ten years. Generally, they were hesitant to predict any type of improvement in fiscal aid from the State. Some of the comments ranged from "Frankly, I think the State will have to work out contractual agreements. If we were not here it would be a burden to the State," to "[I] don't expect any capital construction grants. If it came to that why not have the State buy the schools." Another fiscal officer mentioned that the "funding of the Regents Scholarship Program has helped and we are hopeful it will continue at the highest level." If there is an increase in State aid in the next decade most fiscal officers anticipated it will come in aid to students even though one fiscal officer pointed out that direct grants would be more financially beneficial to the institution.

When asked what part the federal government would play in the finances for this coming decade, the fiscal officers unanimously concurred that without federal aid survival might be impossible. "I don't think we could survive without federal aid. Once federal aid started the institutions have relied on this category to such a degree that without it we could not continue." Another mentioned that "if it doesn't continue we won't be able to do what we want to do and thus we will become a different kind of institution." One fiscal officer mentioned that they are not planning to rely on federal funds. He stated, "We are trying to close out our building program to the point where we'll build only when we have local funds available. We will continue to take advantage of special library, science, general equipment, and research grants."

In conclusion, the financial future seems unstable to many of the fiscal officers. As one stated, "We will have a serious problem in about two years due to two problems: [1] there is no end to the tuition increase and [2] no end to faculty and staff salary [increases]. In ten years we'll need a substantial endowment or considerable current fund aid or we'll be priced out of the market." Another person interviewed said the same thing but placed the blame on the rise in faculty salaries due to the "fantastic" contracts being offered to faculty by state-supported institutions. Along the same line it was stated that there must be some support from public funds. They [the public institutions] have made an assault into private funds. In fact, I think they pay development officers with public funds to ask private enterprise for money." Another stated, "It's getting difficult. Private gifts are harder to get. Private colleges won't make it without selling their souls. We must tell it like it is to the faculty, students and alumni."

> Private colleges must offer something special. Private higher education isn't better just because it's private. The current problems in higher education are forcing the parents to look for a small college and if we don't try to be all things to all men and expand cautiously, we'll be all right.

One fiscal officer summed it up pretty well by stating that the

> . . . financial condition for this institution during the next decade is grave. Economic survival depends on: [1] the ability to produce increased numbers of students, [2] substantial increases in tuition, [3] refinancing of short-term loans incurred during the past decade, and [4] successful performance of recent management reforms.

If institutions can solve these four problems, survival will be closer to a stable situation.

Board Chairman's Reactions

The third administrator interviewed concerning the financial future of the institution was the chairman of the board. Responsible for the institution as a whole, the chairmen displayed keen awareness of the total financial picture and offered many practical suggestions concerning the place of the State in the financial funding of their institutions. When asked if they saw ways in which the State government could increase financial aid to their institutions without jeopardizing current autonomy, they responded as a group with five suggestions. However, many chairmen approach the possibility with caution. One stated, "I am vigorously opposed to federal intervention in education and care must be taken against too much State influence in private independent institutions but increased aid without jeopardizing current autonomy certainly seems feasible and perhaps imperative." Another goes on, "It's just plain delusion to feel that some strings are not attached." The suggestions bear similarity to those offered by the presidents but should be repeated:

1. Scholarships to students to meet the necessary spiraling costs of education; a tuition equalization plan.
2. Subsidizing salaries for faculty desperately needed to serve the people of Florida and its programs.
3. Grants for equipments in specialized areas, library books, classroom buildings.
4. A grant for each Florida student that graduates from a private institution.
5. Contractual agreements to offer certain specialized programs in the State.

The success of one important contractual agreement for a specialized service should be noted. As one chairman reported:

> The University enjoys a unique contractual agreement with the State of Florida to provide medical education to residents of our state. This has been in effect since it was enacted by the Legislature in 1951 which enabled the University to found the first school of medicine in the State. This is an unprecedented success story. More than 800 medical doctors have been graduated from the University as a result of this cooperative program with the State of Florida and at no time has there been any jeopardy in terms of the autonomy of the University. Of course, the University has always had to make responsible and accurate financial statements as to the disposition of these funds received from the State Treasury. This has been done and at no time has the State or the Board of Regents interferred with the establishment of curriculum and in the long-range planning and growth of our School of Medicine. This great success prompts me to believe that the State of Florida might well investigate the establishment of still other contractual arrangements with Florida's private institutions of higher learning. For example, I believe a similar program could be established, with great success in the field of marine sciences, particularly for Florida residents engaged in doctoral programs at accredited Florida institutions, public and private.[10]

When asked what their feeling was about the role of the federal government relating to fiscal affairs, most of the chairmen responded quite positively. For instance, "without government grants, loans, and scholarships, our institution would not be as advanced as it is today. The financial condition of private institutions is likely to become more precarious without additional outside financial assistance." Another chairman cautioned that "the federal government should not interfere with the private college with regard to the subjects of its curriculum or prescribe philosophy, government, economic, or social theory." Many chairmen were quick to point out, however, that "excessive federal control has not been felt." They wanted to stress that:

> The American people are now beginning to feel that everyone qualified has the right for a college or post-high-school education. The financial burdens involved are so vast that undoubtedly the federal government will, and properly, continue to play an ever

---

[10] Permission was received from the board chairman of this institution to print the quote even though it clearly identifies the institution involved.

> more important role in this area. If this can be accomplished without jeopardizing the autonomy of the institution receiving such federal funding, it would be favored.

What effect will the federal government have on their institutions in the next decade? "Hopefully," one stated, "aid will come without federal control." It might come to this, as one chairman so aptly put it, "we want to survive and State and federal aid can help us survive." Actually, the future of the private two- and four-year institution was summarized very well by one chairman when he said, "The financial condition of private institutions is likely to become more precarious without additional outside help." One chairman optimistically thought that "we are building up a constituency of people who have means and are willing to support the college on a continuing basis. We are now getting the interest of foundations. Although it's a long and hard road, our support will be increased."

In summary, it seems apparent that the administrators interviewed concerning this important aspect of the future of their institutions are quite aware of the problems facing them in the future.

VIII. PROBABLE FUTURE

The preceding six sections dealt with critical variables in the determination of the present status and future direction of Florida's independent sector of higher education. Administrative perceptions and institutional data have allowed conjectures to be made concerning the status of this important sector of education. This section will present an indication of how the presidents and the chairmen of the various institutions see the future of independent higher education in general and their institutions in particular. An examination will be made of the future goals of the institutions, their strengths, problems and priorities for change. Finally, each president will offer a prediction of the future of independent higher education.

Future Goals

Generally, purposes or goals on two levels were related during the interviews. Some presidents presented goals that could easily be measured in the next decade to determine success or failure of attainment. Other presidents offered philosophical or theoretical goals, the attainment of which would be very hard to determine. For instance, one president indicated that his institution would strive:

> [1] to furnish a liberal arts education of first rank quality; [2] to accept increasing leadership in the community of higher education; [3] to make as our accustomed method experimentation within the framework of vigorous intellectual discipline; and [4] to continue to assert the value of religion and present the claims of Christianity to society.

It is interesting to note that the board chairman of this institution also pointed out goals in philosophical terms. He indicated the goals of the institution would be to provide "quality education in a church-related school with a Christian commitment and surround faculty and students with the Christian faith."

The second approach to goal development, those goals that can be measured quantitatively, is reflected in this reaction given by a president. He stated four goals to be achieved:

1. Continue the acceleration of the academic pace by strengthening the admission requirements at every level.
2. Strengthen those departments which give promise of national or international significance. Maintain other departments at a service level. Because of finance we must identify signs of promise and then back them.
3. Continue to develop special purpose schools and departments.
4. Look at our geographical location and capitalize on its strength.

The board chairman of the same institution also reflected the quantitative approach to goal development. He stated that the goals of the institution were the following:

1. Maintain solvency in the face of competition from the already authorized degree granting state university scheduled to open in our area.
2. Continue to recruit top flight faculty and staff members.
3. Make the institution serve the great metropolitan community surrounding it.
4. Try to define what the university's graduate commitment should be.
5. Meet the problem arising out of the fact the institution is fast running out of land. We have to grow inward and upward.
6. Convince the public at-large, particularly our peer group of educators, of the quality programs now being conducted by our institution.

With the two approaches to goal development in mind, examples of other presidential responses follow concerning the goals of various independent institutions in Florida.

Institution "A"

- Refine some of the processes of innovation to the point where planned change can become a permanent and orderly feature of our program.
- Augment the practice of inter-disciplinary studies.
- Preserve a sense of discipline within a framework of openness and experimentation.

Institution "B"

- Double resident students.
- Expand graduate studies.
- Meet some needs of local students.
- Fulfill requests of Latin America.
- Experiment in independent learning.

Institution "C"

- Stabilize our curriculum for the students and produce a first class liberal arts college.
- Improve consortium with another institution.
- Develop an institute on Latin American affairs.
- Develop pre-college study program.

Institution "D"

- Develop an educational program for a special clientele.
- Develop urban service area programs.
- Remain flexible in response to curricular changes.
- Attain an enrollment of 3500.
- Become a resident college.

Institution "E"

- Develop Ph.D. programs in all curricula we are now offering.
- Stop undergraduate enrollment at 1500 f.t.e. and develop quality.

Institution "F"

- Prepare students for a wider involvement in all phases of life.
- Preparation for living in a multicultural society.

Institution "G"

- Remain undergraduate liberal arts college.
- Strengthen faculty.
- Develop new ten year program for physical expansion.
- Possible work at graduate level with cooperation of other private colleges.

Institution "H"

- Build an experimental, innovative institution of academic vitality and religious integrity.
- Build an institution characterized by sound business management and an aggressive but dignified development thrust.
- Build an institution engaged in the constant process of interpreting itself.
- Build an undergraduate, residential institution of prime quality.

Institution "I"

- Maintain an institution of relatively small and limited enrollment.
- Build ten or twelve new buildings.
- Create new programs if we adequately secure funds and faculty.

Institution "J"

- Develop a graduate university organized into a series of multidisciplinary centers where students and faculty can mix as peer groups in areas of interest in research and through the centers hope to break the departmental lock-step as it applies to graduate education.
- Remain small. Although size is not our goal, our goal is the multidisciplinary centers.

Institution "K"

- Improve the quality of the program.
- Improve the physical resources.
- Become somewhat more selective in student recruitment.
- Adopt a sound development program.

Upon examination of the preceding goals, it becomes apparent that the approach to goal development varies as greatly as the institutions themselves. Below are examples of responses from the chairmen of the board.

Chairman "A"[1]

- Develop relevant education for an age of change.
- Develop modern applications and preparation for positions of leadership in our society.

---

[1] Letters do not necessarily correspond to presidents' quotes.

Chairman "B"

- Strengthen what is now a quality institution.
- Build needed facilities for research for undergraduate training.
- Initiate a program in marine biology.

Chairman "C"

- Build a much larger endowment.
- Build additional physical facilities.

Chairman "D"

- Increase emphasis on raising academic standards.
- Develop Ph.D. program in the graduate school in all areas by stepped up scientific and engineering research programs.

Chairman "E"

- Emphasize liberal arts.
- Emphasize open door policy to accept marginal students.
- Develop a strong teacher education program in a liberal arts setting.

Chairman "F"

- Work to upgrade character of the institution.
- Keep to limited purpose of the institution.

Chairman "G"

- Limit enrollment to fulfill goals.
- Improve faculty strength.
- Develop God-centered attitude in educational effort.
- Evaluate resources at hand and utilize them.
- Remain flexible.

The goals were mentioned in order to give prespective to the ability of the independent institution to survive. The goals presented are meaningless unless at some future date they can be measured to see if they were attained, or could be attained. The rationale for any institution can usually be understood within the context of the goals toward which it strives.

Institutional Strengths

The chairmen and presidents were asked to describe the strengths of their respective institutions. Table 40 lists, in rank order, the responses received from those interviewed. Most of the administrators felt that their strongest assest could be found in the competence of the faculty to teach. Almost as many responses were given relative to the amount of individual attention offered to the student. It should be indicated that only one administrator thought his institution was strengthened because of cooperative efforts with other institutions.

TABLE 40

INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHS IN RANK ORDER
AS PERCEIVED BY THE PRESIDENTS AND
THE CHAIRMEN OF THE BOARD

1. Faculty Competence in Instruction
2. Individual Attention to Students
3. Curriculum
4. Experimentation and Innovation
5. Specialized Programs
6. Physical Plant
7. Superior Students
8. Administrative Leadership
9. Public Acceptance of Institution
10. Size of Institution
11. Religious Emphasis and Commitment
12. Educational Philosophy
13. Opportunity for Marginal Students
14. Location
15. Cooperate with Other Institutions

Problems and Priorities

Turning to future institutional problems and priorities, it was found that without question the chairmen felt that their most serious problem was one of finances. Table 41 describes the reaction of the chairmen to future problems that may affect the viability of the independent institution in Florida. In addition to financial stability, the chairmen thought that faculty recruitment and physical expansion might cause a moderate problem. All agreed, however, that if the problem of financial solvency could be solved all the other problems would become relatively minor.

TABLE 41

FUTURE PROBLEMS AS PERCEIVED BY THE CHAIRMEN OF THE BOARD

Problem	Serious	Moderate	Slight	No
Physical Expansion	2	9	3	0
Financial Stability	12	2	0	0
Faculty Recruitment	1	7	3	3
Student Recruitment	1	4	6	3
Public Image	0	3	6	5
Threat of New Institution	2	0	0	0

Most presidents also felt that any priorities they had for change were based on the ability to raise the proper funds. If they could initiate change the presidents would do so in the following manner.

President "A"

- Increase faculty time for research and writing. Not relieve faculty from teaching for recreational purposes but for research in teaching.
- Strengthen the quality of the faculty.
- Revise the curriculum.
- Strengthen the library.

President "B"

- Meet the needs of the community; working with the underprivileged and cause economic growth.
- Develop a new program of continuing education.

President "C"

- I don't know, I guess we are doing what we want to do. If we could be on a much sounder basis financially, we could spend more time with educational innovation.

President "D"

- Strengthen faculty.
- Increase the quality of programs and expand in selected areas. We would not accept a fifty million dollar gift to begin a restricted program in medicine. I think that undue proliferation of programs has been the downfall of private higher education institutions.

President "E"

- Immediately raise faculty salaries.
- Institute a program of sabbaticals.
- Change the method of teaching the curriculum.

President "F"

- Increase salaries to a higher standard.
- Add physically to the science area.

President "G"

- Change the student ratio . . . can't afford to keep this ratio.
- Put the college into the problems of the community where it is located.
- Concentrate as a small college, on a small group of majors and do well in a limited area.

President "H"

- Change the accreditation process so the association would understand our specific programs and growth.
- Gain financial support for students to attend private institution.

President "I"

- Develop more independent learning in which the student would be able to take on the responsibility to continue teaching oneself.
- Better integration of the consortium approach.
- Develop doctoral programs in social work.

President "J"

- Reasonable growth toward an optimum size faculty and student body without major changes in orientation.
- More orderly procedures for facilitating experimentation.

President "K"

- Individualized approach to education with more emphasis on the importance of the individual. A program that will enable students to make choices.

The Future

Will the Florida independent sector of higher education survive the next decade, the next twenty-five years? This question was presented to the chairmen and the presidents. The overwhelming majority of chairmen felt their institutions would improve and strengthen themselves over the next twenty-five years. As one chairman stated, "Clearly for our institution there is only one answer to this challenging question: to improve and strengthen ourself." Another more cautious response indicated:

> It is difficult to project for twenty-five years but I am hopeful that private institutions will survive. I believe we will have more State and federal government involvement but not control. If an institution under private control is to survive, it must improve, strengthen itself and present relevant programs of study.

Other chairmen strongly pointed out that:

> Either we will be cooperating fully or coordinating with all others (State and federal agencies) or we'll go out of business. If we open ourselves to all the advantages and recognize that we need financial help we will survive. If it comes to giving our institution over to the State, I wouldn't get too excited about it. We have examples of the most sectarian of institutions doing more for society and the world.
>
> It is too early to tell. We didn't start with the idea of NOT improving and strengthening. We realize now it will be harder than we thought but looking at the past few years I am impressed with the progress. We'll achieve our major goals in ten years.

The presidents took various stands concerning the future of independent higher education. If one generalization could come from their reactions, it would be that the future will force the independent sector away from the traditional concepts that typified this sector a decade ago.

One president predicted that there would be four types of higher educational institutions in the future. He felt, first, the private sector would survive but would rely heavily on federal support. Second, there would be the "quasi-private-state institutions" that would rely heavily on State support but would retain an independent board of control. The third type of institution would be the state supported institution as we know it today, and the fourth type of institution would be the federal college or university established for limited or specialized purposes. The president pointed out strongly that all types of higher learning would be dependent on federal financing.

Another president warned that the two ingredients to survival were "dollars and courage." He said, "If we run scared we're sunk." Furthermore, the same president mentioned there would have to be:

1. A sharing of values with tax-supported institutions especially in humanities and counseling procedures.
2. Closer coordination of smaller colleges with larger universities.
3. More diversity of student bodies, ages, interests, and abilities.

Other presidents' comments on the future direction of independent higher education were:

- We won't fold up because we can continue to draw students. Houston and Buffalo turned over to the state. But we can attract a national clientele. I've always felt quite sanguine about our future here.

- With increasing costs the question of survival of independent higher education has a great deal of merit. If student costs rise it could speed up the problems for independent colleges. I feel the students should bear more of the cost of an education. I have felt that an institution should take into account the resources of a student.

- I don't see how independent higher education can grow unless it gets substantial aid from federal and State sources. Enrollment will decrease. As for direction, it may have to settle on certain areas for special cultivation.

- I am strongly optimistic about the future of private higher education. It is in the public interest that private higher education not wither and die. Industry and business will realize the growth needed for survival.

- It has got to be a dual effort. I believe in this very, very strongly. Public institutions can expand more rapidly. However, I hope we can level off at thirty percent of the student enrollment. At fifteen to twenty percent the country will suffer.

- The future is tied up in the overused term of quality. We are trying to understand its meaning and strive for it. Some new colleges may make it, some will not . . .

- There is a feeling the private institutions will fall prey to the state system. I feel this is due to the competition for private funds. Private institutions must band together to present one case and must persuade the State to help finance and perpetuate their heritage and freedom of independence. Without it, I'm not sure they will survive.

- There will be two types of institutions: State-supported and federally-supported. Private enterprise will not exist as we know it. I would like to see state-supported institutions limited to tax support and private institutions limited to private support.

- There will be more federal involvement. Distinction between the two (public and private) will be fuzzy. Control will be the sole factor. Legislators will begin to see the tremendous economic influence of private higher education and begin to support us. The height of irresponsibility would be to let the private institutions be and then build additional institutions to take their place. Many private institutions will go out of business and it should be so.

- If our expansion is not done leaping out into areas and fields where teachers and equipment are exorbitant and do a first class job teaching, the private institutions can make a tremendous contribution to the educational effort in this country.

  The larger ones will survive. The smaller ones will have to be very cautious in their progress. Consortiums with each institution playing to its power.

- Unless we get some outside help the majority of the private institutions will have to become some specialized kind of college. Specialized in the sense of catering to some type of clientele. We might end up taking students because of their money. I am concerned about the average college, unless it can offer something people are willing to pay for, it will really be in trouble. A lot of them will consolidate.

- Because of the likelihood of expansion of facilities by state and federal governments, I am of the opinion that independent higher education in the next twenty-five years should become more specialized. It should not attempt programs that could be done better and more effectively by publicly supported institutions. Independent higher education might well stress human and community relationships. I believe that contributors would give more readily to programs that are unique and that have relevance in a highly complex and volatile society.

- Private higher education is going to survive. There will be fewer but perhaps they will be stronger. They will have to be in order to survive. We tend to underestimate the dedication of the professors at small colleges.

  Every private institution should examine its commitments for today. Importance comes not from subject matter but from an atmosphere built around attitude.

- Those schools which survive the next ten years will find they will have more students than they can adequately take care of.

Florida independent higher education faces the future with a great deal of administrative caution knowing that the next twenty-five years will be crucial for their institutions. Without State and federal help in the form of cooperation and financial assistance, one might conclude that a very important sector of higher education could pass out of existence.

The results of this study, if it showed anything, displayed the courage of administrators to lay the facts on the table. The general feeling throughout the State reflected that this was no time to hide or distort facts. The next decade could decide the fate of the private sector.

Dr. Algo G. Henderson summarized the plight of all independent higher education when he stated:

> I believe that the private colleges have distinctive roles to play and great contributions to make to society. They need, however, to clarify their purposes in relation to these contributions. They need to redefine what they mean by a liberal education, revise their overgrown curricula, which emulate offerings of the universities,

and manage better their use of faculty and space . . . one question emerges with great persistence: will the advantages of the private colleges be so dramatically evident that students will attend them and pay the costs?[2]

Could it be stated more succinctly?

---

[2] Algo G. Henderson, "How High Can Tuition Go," in Cooperative Long-Range Planning in Liberal Arts Colleges, ed. by Earl J. McGrath (New York: Teachers College Press, 1964), p. 61.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

FINANCIAL REPORTS

INSTITUTION 51

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	59	58	68
Gifts and Grants	31	37	21
Endowment	3	0	6
Gov't App.	0	0	5
Other	7	5	0
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	36	12	10
Instructional	41	52	50
Library	3	7	9
Physical Plant	20	14	18
Other	0	15	13

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$ 425	$1000	$1200
Room and Board	1000	1100	1100
Total	1425	2100	2300
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$1012	$2073	
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	376	1214	
Endowment	$129,000	$150,000	

INSTITUTION 52

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	56	73	80
Gifts and Grants	27	19	8
Endowment	6	3	7
Gov't App.	0	0	0
Other	11	5	5
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	26	33	32
Instructional	48	47	50
Library	6	5	4
Physical Plant	12	10	8
Other	8	5	6

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$360	$1000	$1350
Room and Board	511	600	800
Total	871	1600	2150
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$502	$1629	$1981
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	272	848	1000
Endowment	$1,848,021	$1,373,080	

INSTITUTION 53

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	63	79	
Gifts and Grants	3	19	
Endowment	1	.5	
Gov't App.	0	0	
Other	37	1.5	
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	23	52	
Instructional	39	34	
Library	6	5	
Physical Plant	8	3	
Other	24	8	

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$ 770	$1170	
Room and Board	900	900	
Total	1670	2070	
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$667	$1570	
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	305	582	
Endowment	0	$50,000	

INSTITUTION 58

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	89	91	93
Gifts and Grants	3	4	2
Endowment	0	.5	0
Gov't App.	0	0	0
Other	8	4.5	5
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	27	32	19
Instructional	72	40	63
Library	.5	4	3
Physical Plant	.5	15	10
Other	0	9	5

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$504	$1290	
Room and Board	n/a	885	
Total	504	2175	
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$667	$1570	
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	305	582	
Endowment	0	$50,000	

INSTITUTION 59

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	37	67	49
Gifts and Grants	48	28	44
Endowment	9	1	2
Gov't App.	4	3	4
Other	2	1	1
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	25	18	17
Instructional	49	43	23
Library	8	6	28
Physical Plant	18	22	14
Other	0	11	18

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$ 470	$1008	$1500
Room and Board	794	782	1000
Total	1264	1790	2500
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$907	$1480	$2325
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	517	728	1165
Endowment	$397,498	$270,120	

INSTITUTION 60

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	7	45	67
Gifts and Grants	89	45	30
Endowment	2	1	1
Gov't App.	0	0	0
Other	2	9	2
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	31	29	27
Instructional	41	37	30
Library	6	3	3
Physical Plant	11	12	11
Other	11	19	29

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$1110	$1600	$2700
Room and Board	900	1000	1000
Total	2010	2600	3700
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$2173	$3171	$2462
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	1193	1480	1154
Endowment	$25,163	$684,244	

INSTITUTION 61

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	84	68	71
Gifts and Grants	10	17	15
Endowment	3	12	10
Gov't App.	0	1	1
Other	3	2	3
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	18	18	14
Instructional	43	41	54
Library	5	5	5
Physical Plant	24	20	14
Other	10	16	13

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$ 700	$1390	$2000
Room and Board	570	800	1300
Total	1270	2190	3300
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$820	$1937	$2548
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	387	885	1516
Endowment	$2,133,484	$8,241,577	

INSTITUTION 62

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	71	90	83
Gifts and Grants	7	6	4
Endowment	1	2	9
Gov't App.	19	1	2
Other	2	1	2
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	27	15	12
Instructional	49	61	62
Library	12	5	4
Physical Plant	12	13	16
Other	0	6	6

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$491	$ 990	$1850
Room and Board	n/a	900	1100
Total	491	1890	2950
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$833	$1305	$2950
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	502	859	1433
Endowment	$147,463	$1,515,929	

INSTITUTION 65

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	22	37	74
Gifts and Grants	70	61	14
Endowment	0	0	0
Gov't App.	0	0	0
Other	8	2	12
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	30	32	22
Instructional	37	42	56
Library	6	6	5
Physical Plant	11	8	7
Other	16	12	10

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees		$2625	$3240
Room and Board		1140	1300
Total		3765	4520
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$8910	$5140	$3625
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	4650	2700	2393
Endowment	0	$26,500	

INSTITUTION 67

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	68	68	69
Gifts and Grants	17	21	19
Endowment	13	8	8
Gov't App.	0	1	1
Other	2	2	3
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	25	21	16
Instructional	48	49	50
Library	3	3	3
Physical Plant	17	17	16
Other	7	10	15

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$1181	$1953	$3100
Room and Board	900	1100	1600
Total	2081	3053	4700
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$1495	$1782	$2448
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	763	665	1272
Endowment	$4,368,310	$7,716,625	

3

INSTITUTION 68

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	14	68	80
Gifts and Grants	77	26	12
Endowment	0	0	0
Gov't App.	4	3	5
Other	5	3	2
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	20	30	30
Instructional	57	45	45
Library	13	7	6
Physical Plant	7	18	19
Other	3	0	0

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees			
Room and Board			
Total			
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.		$1189	
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.		536	
Endowment	0	0	

INSTITUTION 69

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	87	94	94
Gifts and Grants	10	1	4
Endowment	0	1	.5
Gov't App.	0	0	1
Other	3	4	.5
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	40	35	33
Instructional	27	46	46
Library	8	5	6
Physical Plant	18	14	15
Other	7	0	0

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$ 825	$1200	$1600
Room and Board	825	1160	1260
Total	1650	2360	2860
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$1052	$1360	$1571
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	360	693	808
Endowment	0	$107,997	

INSTITUTION 70

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	64	80	82
Gifts and Grants	14	14	11
Endowment	9	4	5
Gov't App.	0	0	0
Other	13	2	2
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	17	16	17
Instructional	55	57	53
Library	4	3	4
Physical Plant	10	13	10
Other	14	11	16

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$ 760	$1500	$1900
Room and Board	650	950	1050
Total	1410	2450	2950
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$1336	$1887	$1903
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	798	1143	1122
Endowment	$1,525,000	$4,967,761	

INSTITUTION 71

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	48	39	39
Gifts and Grants	42	52	52
Endowment	1	1	1
Gov't App.	0	0	0
Other	9	8	8
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	9	10	11
Instructional	36	28	29
Library	3	3	3
Physical Plant	7	5	6
Other	39	51	51

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$1300	$1800	$1875
Room and Board	464	900	1150
Total	1764	2700	3025
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$2788	$4086	$5421
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	1095	1250	1708
Endowment	$5,316,000	$17,222,658	

INSTITUTION 72

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	84	87	91
Gifts and Grants	7	6	6
Endowment	1	1	1
Gov't App.	6	5	2
Other	2	1	0
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	35	39	25
Instructional	44	44	62
Library	3	3	3
Physical Plant	18	14	10
Other	0	0	0

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees	$600	$1200	$1650
Room and Board	270	1000	1150
Total	870	2200	2800
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$1003	$1080	$1638
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	472	508	1057
Endowment	$584,624	$767,858	

INSTITUTION 73

EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL

	Past Percentage	Present Percentage	Future Percentage
Income			
Tuition	69	42	68
Gifts and Grants	30	56	32
Endowment	1	2	0
Gov't App.	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
Expenditures			
Admin. and General	43	22	40
Instructional	51	69	53
Library	.5	3	2
Physical Plant	4.5	6	5
Other	0	0	0

	Past	Present	Future
Tuition and Fees			
Room and Board			
Total	$1527	$1850	$2850
Educational and General Expenditure per f.t.e.	$912	$1867	$1340
Instruction and Library Expenditure per f.t.e.	472	1295	721
Endowment	$59,000	$211,144.50	

APPENDIX B.

STUDY PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX B. STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Institution	President	Dean	Fiscal	Chairman
51	X	X	X	X
52	X	X	X	X
53	X	X	X	X
54	X	X	X	
55	X	X	X	X
58	X	X	X	X
59	X	X	X	X
60	X	X	X	
61	X	X	X	X
62	X	X	X	X
64	X	X	X	
65	X	X	X	X
66	X	X	X	X
67		X	X	
68	X		X	X
69	X	X	X	X
70	X	X	X	X
71	X	X	X	X
72	X	X	X	
73	X	X	X	

APPENDIX C.

CURRICULUM STUDY

INSTITUTIONS GRANTING THE BACCALAUREATE DEGREE IN THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMS

Program	Institution																		
	51	52	53	54	55	58	59	60	61	62	64	65	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
Accounting			X				X			X						X	X		
Aeronautical Engineering					X														
Aerospace Studies					X														
Aircraft Maintenance					X														
American Civilization																	X		
American Studies																X			
Architecture																	X		
Art	X							X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	
Astronomy																			
Aviation Management					X											X			
Behavioral Science													X						
Biology	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	
Biochemistry																	X		
Biomedical Engineering																			
Business	X	X	X				X		X	X					X	X	X	X	

Program	Institution																		
	51	52	53	54	55	58	59	60	61	62	64	65	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
Business Education																	X		
Chemistry	X	X						X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	
Chinese																			
Citrus and Subtropical Horticulture									X										
Civil Engineering																	X		
Computer Science						X													
Contract Management						X													
Creative Writing																			
East Asian Area Studies								X											
Economics	X						X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	
Education, Elementary	X	X	X	X			X		X	X			X		X	X	X	X	
Electrical Engineering						X											X		
Engineering																	X		
English	X	X		X			X		X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	
Finance																X	X		
Fine Arts; Expressive Arts										X		X	X						
French	X	X							X	X			X		X	X	X	X	

Program	Institution																		
	51	52	53	54	55	58	59	60	61	62	64	65	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
General Business																	X		
General Science				X															
Geography										X						X	X		
Geology																	X		
German								X	X	X			X		X	X	X		
Graphics																			
Greek								X											
Hebrew																			
Hispanic-American Studies																	X		
History; History and Public Affairs	X	X		X			X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	
Home and Family Life	X																		
Humanities			X				X												
Human Relations																	X		
Industrial Arts									X								X	X	
Industrial Engineering																	X		
Insurance																	X		
Italian																			

Program	Institution																		
	51	52	53	54	55	58	59	60	61	62	64	65	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
Journalism									X										
Languages												X							
Latin	X							X											
Library Science																			
Linguistics																			
Literature								X				X							
Management																X	X		
Marketing										X							X		
Mass Communications																	X		
Mathematics	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	
Mechanics; Mechanical Engineering																	X		
Medical Technology		X								X							X	X	X
Military Science; Tactics																			
Music Education																		X	
Music	X	X	X				X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	
Natural Sciences																			
Nursing	X																X		

Program	Institution																		
	51	52	53	54	55	58	59	60	61	62	64	65	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
Oceanography						X													
Ocean Engineering						X											X		
Operations Research						X													
Philosophy		X						X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		
Philosophy and Religion																			
Physical Education; Health, Recreation, Athletics		X	X				X		X	X					X		X	X	
Physical Science																			
Physics		X				X		X	X	X		X	X			X	X		
Political Science; Government								X	X	X		X			X	X	X		
Portuguese																			
Pre-Dentistry																			
Pre-Engineering																			
Pre-Law										X									
Pre-Medicine										X			X						
Pre-Veterinary Science																			
Psychology		X					X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	

Program	Institution																		
	51	52	53	54	55	58	59	60	61	62	64	65	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
Reading																			
Religion; Theology	X						X		X							X	X		
Russian								X								X	X		
Science Education																			
Secretarial Science															X				
Science			X																
Social Studies; Social Sciences				X															
Sociology;Anthropology Behavioral Science	X	X					X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	
Space Science						X													
Space Technology						X													
Space Management						X													
Spanish	X	X						X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	
Special Courses																			
Speech	X								X						X		X		
Speech and Drama	X															X			
Statistics																			
Systems Management																			

Program	Institution																		
	51	52	53	54	55	58	59	60	61	62	64	65	67	68	69	70	71	72	73
Theatre; Drama	X									X			X		X		X		
Updating Management																			
Urban Services							X												
Vocational Education																			

APPENDIX D.

PRESENT STATUS AND FUTURE DIRECTION OF INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION IN FLORIDA

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TABLE I

Physical Facilities Institution____

A. What is the current replacement value of your physical plant? $________

B. What is the current cost value of your physical plant? $________

C. NUMBER AND ESTIMATE COST OF NEW CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF PROJECTS FALL 1968 TO FALL 1980*

	Number of Projects	Estimated Costs
1. Instructional		
2. Research		
3. General		
4. Auxiliary		
5. Residential		
6. Campus Improvements		
TOTAL		

*Realizing that master planning may not extend to 1980, please project to the latest date you have used and note year.

TABLE II

Physical Facilities

Institution____

ANTICIPATED SOURCES OF FUNDS TO FINANCE PHYSICAL EXPANSION
1968-1980

	Instructional	Research	General	Auxiliary	Residential	Campus Improvements
I. Governmental Appropriations						
State Governments						
Local Governments						
II. Federal Government Grants						
Title I, HEFA - 63						
Title II, HEFA - 63						
Public Health Service						
National Science Foundation						
III. General Obligation Bonds						
Institutional						
Title III, HEFA - 63						
Municipal Bonds						
IV. Revenue Bonds						
College Housing Loan Program (HEFA)						
V. Other						
Pledged Student Building Fees						
Gifts and Grants						
Current Funds						
Endowment Funds (Invested)						
Borrowed from Commercial Sources						
Source Unknown						

Check (X) those sources that you plan to use for the respective classifications.

P-2

Institution____

PART I: THE PRESIDENT

During this interview you will be asked to give your ideas, observations, and perceptions concerning the present status and future direction of Florida independent higher education in general and your institution in particular. In order for the minimum of interviewer bias to enter the session, I will ask the questions as they are presented in the interview schedule. Following the structured questions you may make additional comments or clarify what has previously been discussed. In the report information will not be referred to by administrator or institution.

1. What do you consider the major educational goals of your institution in the next ten years?

2. What do you feel are the major strengths of your instituiton?

3. If the proper groundwork was laid, what would be your priorities for institutional change?

4. Do you have a public relations office? Yes No

   What are the main goals of your public relations effort?

5. Have you made studies to determine your "image" in the local community and/or the State of Florida?

6. Do you feel there is any confusion in the minds of Floridians concerning the function of independent higher education in the State?

7. Do you have a master plan for future physical growth? Yes___ No___

8. What years does the master plan cover? ____________________________

Institution____

9. Campus plans stress many different items. Could you elaborate on the types of items you have included in your planning projections (e.g., new facilities and rehabilitation of old buildings, enrollment projections, curriculum needs, etc.)?

10. What is the extent of contribution to campus planning on the part of the following? (Please rate the following planning participants according to the scale noted below.)

1. The person or group has made a MAJOR CONTRIBUTION.
2. The person or group has made a MODERATE CONTRIBUTION.
3. The person or group has made a SLIGHT CONTRIBUTION.
4. The person or group has made NO CONTRIBUTION.

_____A. Board of Trustees

_____ 1. Committees

_____ 2. Individual members

_____B. President

_____C. Academic Dean or Vice-President

_____D. Chief Fiscal Officer

_____E. Chief Development Officer

_____F. Faculty

_____G. Students

_____H. Local Citizens

_____I. Donors

_____J. Professional Consultants (what type?)

____

____

____

Institution____

____K. State Agencies (which ones?)

____

____

____

____L. Federal Agencies (which ones?)

____

____

____

____M. Other

____

____

____

11. One of the objectives of an institution of higher learning is to effectively achieve maximum utilization of its physical resources. In attempting to achieve this objective do you make use of the following procedures?

____A. Use of management information systems and procedures.

____B. Maintenance of utilization records.

____C. Computer scheduling.

____D. Sharing facilities with other institutions.

____E. Other

____

____

12. During the past ten years did your "real" growth keep pace with the projected growth needed to sufficiently carry out the educational programs of your institution?

Institution____

13. There are those who feel that state agencies could aid independent higher education in planning for physical expansion. If so, how do you feel the State of Florida could assist?

14. There is currently a great deal of discussion concerning state funding and its effect on institutional autonomy. Can you see ways in which the State government could increase financial aid to your institution without jeopardizing current autonomy?

15. There are some who have predicted that in the future the federal government will be responsible for fifty percent (or more) of the educational and general income of an independent institution. Whether or not this may be an unrealistic estimate:

    A. What is your feeling about the role of the federal government relating to fiscal affairs?

    B. In general, what effect will the federal government have on your institution in the next ten years?

16. What changes, if any, will be needed by 1980 in your educational and general income in order to carry out the educational goals of your institution?

17. What do you consider the proper relationship between your institution and:

    A. Other independent institutions?

    B. State agencies (Florida Development Commission, State Planning Commission, etc.)?

    C. The State University System?

    D. The State Junior College System?

18. At the October (1968) SCOPE meeting in Jacksonville, Florida, a desire for statewide master-planning was expressed by the presidents of independent institutions of higher learning. With that in mind, would you elaborate on the type of master-planning you would endorse? (Would you please speak to the following points?)

Institution____

A. Membership (if you would endorse a planning board)

B. Duties

C. Powers

D. Procedures

19. What would be the role and scope of "Master Planning" concerning the following?

A. Physical Expansion

B. Financial Stability

C. Student Enrollment and Recruitment

D. Curriculum and Instruction

E. Establishment of New Institutions

F. Other

20. There has been a great deal of discussion relative to the survival of independent higher education. As president of an independent institution of higher learning, what do you feel will be the direction of independent higher education in the next twenty-five years?

Institution____

TO: ACADEMIC DEAN OR ACADEMIC VICE-PRESIDENT

RE: ENROLLMENT, STUDENT CHARGES, AND STUDENT FINANCIAL AID
(TABLES I, II, III, IV)

I. The purpose of this institutional data is to obtain information in regard to enrollment trends, student charges, and student financial aid of independent institutions in the State of Florida.

II. The tables are so designed to provide information to all levels of administration in such a manner that it is comparable, comprehensive, and unbiased. In the report, information will not be referred to by administrator or institution.

III. Definitions

A. FTE Students--Use fifteen (15) credit hours to equal one full-time undergraduate student; twelve (12) credit hours to equal one graduate student.

B. Tuition and Fees--Enter amounts for tuition and fees charged all full-time students. Fees may include such items as a student union fee, athletic ticket fee, student yearbook fee, etc.

C. Housing and Board

1. Room--Average charge for a single student sharing a double room in institutional facilities for academic year.

2. Board--Average charge for a student who contracts to eat in institutional dining halls for two semesters.

D. Student Financial Aid--Any aid granted to a student which may be used for educational expenses.

TABLE I

Enrollment Data

Institution_____

UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT (FTE)

(Actual and Projected)

Category	1959-60	1964-65	1968-69	1974-75*	1979-80*
Florida Resident					
Men					
Women					
Other States					
Men					
Women					
Foreign					
Men					
Women					
Total					
Men					
Women					
Grand Total					

*If you do not have projections for the years given above BUT have projections for other years in the future, please give the projection(s) and state appropriate year(s).

TABLE II

Enrollment Data Institution____

FIRST TIME FRESHMEN ENROLLMENT

(Actual and Projected)

Category	1959-60	1964-65	1968-69	1974-75*	1979-80*
Florida Resident					
Men					
Women					
Other States					
Men					
Women					
Foreign					
Men					
Women					
Total					
Men					
Women					
Grand Total					

*If you do not have projections for the years given above BUT have projections for other years in the future, please give the projection(s) and state appropriate year(s).

- -

________A. What percentage of your freshmen class leaves after one year?

________B. Approximately what percentage of your freshmen class will receive the two-year degree (junior college respondent) or four-year degree (senior college respondent)?

TABLE II-B

Enrollment Data

Institution_____

TOTAL ENROLLMENT

(Actual and Projected)

Category	1959-60	1964-65	1968-69	1974-75*	1979-80*
Head Count					
A. Undergraduate					
B. Graduate					
C. Special					
Total Head Count					
FTE Count					
A. Undergraduate					
B. Graduate					
C. Special					
Total FTE Count					

*If you do not have projections for the years given above BUT have projections for other years in the future, please give the projection(s) and state appropriate year(s).

- -

A. At what level of enrollment would you currently consider as total capacity of your institution?

____

B. What year do you expect to achieve this enrollment? _______________

TABLE III

Enrollment Data

Institution____

MEAN STUDENT CHARGES FOR ACADEMIC YEAR

(Actual and Projected)

Category	1959-60	1964-65	1968-69	1974-75*	1979-80*
Tuition					
Other Fees					
Housing					
Board					
Total					

*If you do not have projections for the years given above BUT have projections for other years in the future, please give the projection(s) and state appropriate year(s).

TABLE IV

Enrollment Data

Institution____

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

Category	1959-60		1964-65		1968-69	
	Number	Dollar Amount	Number	Dollar Amount	Number	Dollar Amount
Institutional Scholarships and Grants						
Regents Scholarships						
Florida Teachers Scholarships						
Florida Nursing Scholarships						
Federal Guaranteed Loans						
Federal NDEA Loans						
Federal College Work-Study						
Special Funds from Business and Industry						
Other						
Total						

Institution____

PART II: THE ACADEMIC DEAN OR ACADEMIC VICE-PRESIDENT

During this interview you will be asked to give your ideas, observations, and perceptions concerning the present status and future direction of Florida independent higher education in general and your institution in particular. In order for the minimum of interviewer bias to enter the session, I will ask the questions as they are presented in the interview schedule. Following the structured questions you may make additional comments or clarify what has previously been discussed. In the report, information will not be referred to by administrator or institution.

1. a. In what major fields do you offer undergraduate degrees and graduate degrees at the master's level? (Investigator will note if bulletin or catalog is available at time of interview.)

   b. In what professional programs (nursing, teacher education, engineering, etc.) do you offer undergraduate degrees and graduate degrees at the master's level? (Investigator will note if bulletin or catalog is available at time of interview.)

   c. According to the following categories, how many degrees did your institution grant during the 1967-68 school year? (Include summer sessions.)

   ____A. Associate Degree

   ____B. Bachelor's Degree

   ____C. Master's Degree

   ____D. Doctor's Degree

2. a. Do you feel you should expand your present educational programs and/or create new programs in the next ten years?

   b. Should you curtail any of the programs you now offer in the next ten years?

3. What information do you use to support expansion, creation, or elimination of academic programs at your institution?

Institution____

4. There has been a great deal of discussion relative to duplication of instructional programs at public and independent institutions. What do you feel about duplication of instructional programs in liberal/general studies? In professional (nursing, engineering, etc.) programs? If you feel it is necessary to prevent undesirable duplication, could you offer suggestions how this could be prevented?

5. What is the number of your full-time faculty by academic rank?

Rank	Highest Degree Held		
	Doctorate	Master's	Bachelor's
Professor			
Associate Professor			
Assistant Professor			
Instructor			
Total			

6. What is the median salary for full-time faculty by academic rank?

A. Professor $______________

B. Associate Professor $______________

C. Assistant Professor $______________

D. Instructor $______________

7. What is your current faculty work load?

A. Teaching (%) ______

B. Research (%) ______

C. Other (%) ______

D. Undergraduate Teaching Credit Hours (avg.) ______

C. Clock Hours Per Week ______

Institution____

8. How many full-time faculty members do you anticipate recruiting in the next ten years?

____

9. Problems in Obtaining Faculty Members. (Please check below those factors which make it difficult for your institution to obtain new faculty members.)

____A. Fringe Benefits Not Competitive

____B. High Cost of Living

____C. Inability to Pay Moving Expenses

____D. Inability to Provide Travel Reimbursement for Interviews

____E. Inadequate Office Space

____F. Inadequate Housing in Community

____G. Lack of Research Opportunities

____H. Library

____I. Location of Institution

____J. Poor Facilities

____K. Salaries Are Not Competitive

____L. Teaching Load at This Institution

____M. Other:

____

____

10. How do you provide for your faculty's professional growth?

____A. Sabbaticals

____ How many were awarded last year?

____B. Non-Paid Leaves

____ How many were granted last year?

____C. Funds for Research (Institutional Funds Only)

Institution____

10. (continued)

____D. Payment of Professional Membership Fees

____E. Travel Expenses to Professional Meetings

____F. Other:

____

____

11. What fringe benefits are available to full-time faculty members?

____A. Social Security

____B. Retirement other than Social Security

____ TIAA-CREF

____C. Group Hospitalization

____D. Major Medical Coverage

____E. Accident Insurance

____F. Life Insurance

____G. Health Service Provided

____H. Reduction or Waiver of Tuition to Dependents of Faculty

____I. Sick Leave with Pay

____J. Provide Housing

____K. Loan Fund Available for Making Sizable Purchases (houses, travel, etc.)

____L. Significant Recreation Facilities Provided

____M. Other:

____

____

12. Library Materials (Bound Volumes--Books and Periodicals)

1963-64	1968-69	1974-75(Projection)

Institution____

If any of the following are characteristic of your institution, courses, or programs, please make a check at the left of the item. For all items please indicate your estimate of its future in your institution.

	Within the Next Ten Years		
	Will not be instituted or substantially changed	Will be discontinued or decreased	Will be instituted or increased
13. TEACHING MEDIA			
___A. Closed Circuit Television	___	___	___
___B. Regional E.T.V.	___	___	___
___C. Video Tape	___	___	___
___D. Language Laboratory	___	___	___
___E. Learning and/or Listening Laboratories	___	___	___
___F. Programmed Instruction	___	___	___
___G. Computer Assisted Instruction	___	___	___
___H. Instructional Films	___	___	___
___I. Independent Study	___	___	___
___J. Other	___	___	___

Institution____

If any of the following are characteristic of your institution, courses, or programs, please make a check at the left of the item. For all items, please indicate your estimate of its future in your institution.

		Within the Next Ten Years		
		Will not be instituted or substantially changed	Will be discontinued or decreased	Will be instituted or increased
14.	CURRICULUM			
___	A. General/Liberal Studies	___	___	___
___	1. During the entire undergraduate program	___	___	___
___	2. During first two years	___	___	___
___	B. Professional Studies	___	___	___
___	1. During the entire undergraduate program	___	___	___
	2. During last two years	___	___	___
___	C. Emphasis on Major	___	___	___
___	1. During the entire undergraduate program	___	___	___
___	2. During last two years	___	___	___
15.	DEGREES GRANTED			
___	A. A.A. or A.S.	___	___	___
___	B. B.A.	___	___	___
___	C. B.S.	___	___	___
___	D. B.Ed.	___	___	___
___	E. M.A.	___	___	___
___	F. M.S.	___	___	___
___	G. M.Ed.	___	___	___

Institution____

If any of the following are characteristic of your institution, courses, or programs, please make a check at the left of the item. For all items please indicate your estimate of its future in your institution.

	Within the Next Ten Years		
	Will not be instituted or substantially changed	Will be discontinued or decreased	Will be instituted or increased
15. DEGREES GRANTED (cont'd)			
___H. Ph.D.	___	___	___
___I. Ed.D.	___	___	___
___J. Other:			
___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___
16. ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES			
A. Academic Calendar			
___1. Semester	___	___	___
___2. Trimester	___	___	___
___3. Quarter	___	___	___
___4. Year-Round (equal enrollment)	___	___	___
___5. 4-1-4, 15-4-15, Inter-Term	___	___	___
___6. Other:			
___	___	___	___
___	___	___	___
B. Computer Use			
___1. Class Scheduling	___	___	___
___2. Registrar's Office (Others)	___	___	___
___3. Admissions	___	___	___
___4. Student Personnel	___	___	___

Institution____

If any of the following are characteristic of your institution, courses, or programs, please make a check at the left of the item. For all items please indicate your estimate of its future in your institution.

	Within the Next Ten Years		
	Will not be instituted or substantially changed	Will be discontinued or decreased	Will be instituted or increased
16. ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES (cont'd)			
____C. Special Committee to stimulate and assist innovation, change, experimental courses and practices	____	____	____
D. Evaluation of programs, methods, and structures is carried out by:			
____1. A part-time or full-time evaluation officer	____	____	____
____2. A faculty committee	____	____	____
____3. Individuals; as they see need for evaluation	____	____	____
____E. An organized effort is made to introduce faculty to the possible uses of new media	____	____	____

Institution____

20. Which of the following recruitment efforts have been the most successful at your institution? (Please rate according to scale noted below.)

1. Very Successful
2. Successful
3. Not Successful

____A. High School Visitations

____B. College Night Visitations

____C. Alumni Recruitment

____D. Mail Campaigns

____E. Use of Commercial Admissions Centers

____F. Cooperative Effort by Two or More Institutions

____G. Other:

____

____

21. Some educators have felt that the State of Florida could aid the increase of student enrollment in private institutions. Other educators feel that it is not the State's responsibility to assist in recruiting efforts for independent higher education.

What do you feel is the proper role of the State in the area of student recruitment?

22. What cooperative efforts (academic) has your institution engaged in with other institutions--public or independent?

Endeavor	Institutions Included	Years
A.		
B.		
C.		
D.		
E.		

Institution____

17. Do you use the following criteria for admission to your freshman class? If you check any of the following, would you please state minimum requirements?

____A. High School Grades ____________________

____B. High School Rank ____________________

____C. Entrance Examinations

  ____1. Florida 12th Grade Examination ____________________

  ____2. S.A.T. ____________________

  ____3. A.C.T. ____________________

  ____4. Institutional Examination ____________________

  ____5. Other Examinations

  ____

  ____

____D. Other Requirements

____

____

18. There are many reasons why a student chooses a college. Broadly speaking, what are the major attractions of your institution?

19. There has been an attempt in recent years to determine what types of personalities are attracted to various campuses. Has your institution carried on a testing program to determine its "environmental press"?

Yes____ No____

If Yes, what tests were used? ____________________

____

Would you care to comment on the findings?

Institution____

23. If your institution has engaged in cooperative efforts, what have been the strengths of such programs? The weaknesses?

24. Are you planning any cooperative academic efforts with other institutions (public or independent) in addition to those mentioned?

25. As you face the future, what do you consider the greatest problem(s) in the area of curriculum, instruction, and faculty?

Institution____

STUDENT QUESTIONS

1. Generally speaking, why did you choose to attend this institution?

___A. Academic Programs

___B. Specialized Programs

___C. Social Life

___D. Location

___E. Parents are Alumni

___F. High School Counselor

___G. Departmental Strength

___H. Religious Emphasis

___I. Other: ____________

___J. Other: ____________

2. If you had the opportunity to make the choice again, would you choose this institution?

3. Do you think there are any advantages in attending an independent institution as opposed to a public institution? What are they?

Institution____

TO: CHIEF FISCAL OFFICER

RE: EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL INCOME AND EXPENDITURES (TABLES I AND II)

I. The purpose of this section is to obtain information in regard to educational and general income and expenditures of independent institutions in the State of Florida.

II. The tables are so designed to provide financial and operating information to all levels of administration in such a manner that it is comparable, comprehensive, unbiased, and in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles as prescribed by the American Council on Education for Institutions of Higher Education. In the report, information will not be referred to by administrator or institution.

III. Definitions

A. Educational and General Income

1. Student Tuition and Fees--All tuition, general and specific fees assessed against students for educational and general purposes. DO NOT include such charges as those for room, board, and services rendered by auxiliary enterprises.

2. Governmental Appropriations--All amounts received from or made available by governmental sources out of governmental revenues, which are expendable for educational and general purposes. Income used for contract research should be excluded.

3. Endowment Income--Income earned on the investment of endowment and other non-expendable funds available for educational and general purposes. If endowment funds include real estate, only the net income from such property should be reported.

4. Gifts and Grants--All unrestricted gifts expendable for educational and general purposes and all restricted gifts expended during the period of this report for educational and general purposes.

5. Sales and Services of Educational Departments--Incidental income of educational departments such as proceeds from sale of departmental publications, etc.

6. Organized Activities Relating to Educational Departments--Gross income of organized activities operated in connection with instructional departments and conducted primarily for the purpose of giving professional training to students (e.g., lab schools and home economics cafeterias).

Institution____

7. Other Sources of Income--Income from current fund investments, net rentals received from outside agencies or persons for the use of auditoriums, tennis courts, equipment, etc.

8. Auxiliary Enterprises--Income from operations such as dormitories and cafeterias.

9. Student Aid--Grants, Loans, Scholarships, etc.

B. Educational and General Expenditures

1. General Administration and Expense--All expenditures of the general executive and administrative offices serving the institution as a whole such as those of the governing board, president and business officer. All expenditures which are of a general character not relating to any specific division of the institution.

2. Instruction and Departmental--Expenditures incurred for instructional programs for students pursuing regular course of study on campus which lead generally to a collegiate degree. All expenditures of organized activities operated in connection with instructional departments and conducted primarily for the purpose of giving professional training to students. Amounts reported under this heading should include expenditures for departmental research not separately budgeted or financed.

3. Organized Research--Expenditures of all separately organized research divisions as well as all expenditures for separately budgeted or financed research investigation. This includes expenditures for contract research.

4. Extension and Public Service--Expenditures of educational and other activities designed primarily to serve the general public. These activities include off-campus courses, adult study courses, public lectures, institutes and similar activities.

5. Libraries--All expenditures of the institution for separately organized libraries, both general and departmental.

6. Operation and Maintenance of Physical Plant--The aggregate expense of the physical plant of the entire institution, except those expenditures charged directly to auxiliary enterprises or other functional classifications. Do not report projects financed by capital outlay.

7. Auxiliary Enterprises--Expenses for operation of dormitories, cafeterias, and other operations.

8. Student--Grants, Loans, and Scholarships.

TABLE I

Financial Affairs

Institution____

CURRENT EXPENDITURES

(Actual and Projected)

Category	1959-60	1964-65	1968-69	1974-75*	1979-80*
I. Education and General					
General Administration Expenses					
Departmental Instructional					
Research					
Extension and Public Service					
Library					
Operation and Maintenance of Physical Plant					
Other					
Total Education and General					
II. Auxiliary Enterprises					
III. Student Aid					
Total Current Expenditures					

*If you do not have projections for the years given above BUT have projections for other years in the future, please give the projection(s) and state appropriate year(s).

TABLE II

Financial Affairs

Institution____

CURRENT INCOME

(Actual and Projected)

Category	1959-60	1964-65	1968-69	1974-75*	1979-80*
I. Educational and General					
Student Tuition and Fees					
Government Appropriations					
Endowment Income					
Gifts and Grants					
Sales and Services of Educational Departments					
Organized Activities of Educational Departments					
Other Sources					
Total Educational and General					
II. Auxiliary Enterprises					
III. Student Aid					
Total Current Income					

*If you do not have projections for the years given above BUT have projections for other years, please give the projection(s) and state appropriate year(s).

Institution____

PART III: THE CHIEF FISCAL OFFICER

During this interview you will be asked to give your ideas, observations, and perceptions concerning the present status and future direction of Florida independent higher education in general and your institution in particular. In order for the minimum of interviewer bias to enter the session, I will ask the questions as they are presented on the interview schedule. Following the structured questions you may make additional comments or clarify what has previously been discussed. In the report, information will not be referred to by administrator or institution.

1. What is the average yearly instructional cost of an UNDERGRADUATE education per full-time student?

   $______________

   (In order to have uniform and comparable results from this figure, would you please calculate the average cost according to the following formula?)

$$\text{COST} = \frac{\text{Departmental and Instructional Expenses* + Library Expenses}}{\text{FTE Students (Using 15 credit hours = 1 FTE Student)}}$$

   *Faculty salaries, secretarial help, laboratory expenses, etc. Refer to definition of terms.

2. A. What was your endowment in 1959? $______________

   B. What is your endowment today? $______________

3. A. What was your capital outlay expense during the past ten years (1959-1968)?

   $______________

   B. What was your capital outlay expense last year (1968)?

   $______________

4. In what federally supported programs do you currently participate that are included in your educational and general income? (Non-capital outlay)

   ____

   ____

Institution____

5. What do you anticipate will be the financial relationship between the federal government and your institution in the next ten years?

6. In what State supported programs do you currently participate that are included in your educational and general income? (Non-capital outlay)

____

____

7. What do you anticipate will be the financial relationship between the State government and your institution in the next ten years?

8. What part has the local community played in the financial support of your institution?

9. What is your personal appraisal of the future financial condition of your institution over the next ten years?

Institution____

PART IV: THE CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

During this interview you will be asked to give your ideas, observations, and perceptions concerning the present status and future direction of Florida independent higher education in general and your institution in particular. In order for the minimum of interviewer bias to enter the session, I will ask the questions as they are presented in the interview schedule. Following the structured questions you may make additional comments or clarify what has previously been discussed. In the report information will not be referred to by administrator or institution.

1. What do you consider the major educational goals of your institution in the next ten years?

2. What do you feel are the major strengths of your institution?

3. Independent higher education will be facing many difficult problems in the next ten years. As you see it, what are the major problems at your institution? (Please rate the following problem areas according to the scale noted below.)

    1. Serious Problem
    2. Moderate Problem
    3. Slight Problem
    4. No Problem

____A. Physical Expansion

____B. Financial Stability

____C. Faculty Recruitment

____D. Student Recruitment

____E. Public Image

____F. Other (Please list and rate)

____

____

____

Institution_____

4. What type of "image" is your institution projecting in the community in which it is located? In the State?

5. Do you feel there is any confusion in the minds of Floridians concerning the function of independent higher education in the State?

6. There is currently a great deal of discussion concerning State funding and its effect on institutional autonomy. Can you see ways in which the State government could increase financial aid to your institution without jeopardizing current autonomy?

7. There are some who have predicted that in the future the federal government will be responsible for fifty percent (or more) of the educational and general income of an independent institution. Whether or not this is an unrealistic estimate:

   A. What is your feeling about the role of the federal government relating to fiscal affairs?

   B. In general, what effect will the federal government have on your institution in the next ten years?

8. What do you see as the financial condition of your institution in the next ten years?

9. What do you consider the proper relationship between your institution and

   A. Other Independent Institutions

   B. State Agencies

   C. State University System

   D. State Junior College System

Institution____

10. At the October (1968) SCOPE meeting in Jacksonville, Florida, a desire for statewide master-planning was expressed by the presidents of independent institutions of higher learning. With that in mind, would you elaborate on the type of master-planning you would endorse? (Would you please speak to the following points?)

    A. Membership (if you would endorse a planning board)

    B. Duties

    C. Powers

    D. Procedures

11. What would be the role and scope of master-planning concerning the following points?

    A. Financial Stability

    B. Physical Expansion

    C. Student Enrollment and Recruitment

    D. Curriculum and Instruction

    E. Establishment of New Institutions

    F. Other

12. There has been a great deal of discussion relative to the survival of independent higher education in America. As chairman of the board of an independent institution of higher learning, what do you feel will be the direction of your institution in the next twenty-five years? (You may wish to choose one of the following alternatives: (a) remain status quo, (b) become state controlled, (c) sold or closed, (d) improve and strengthen itself.)